

# Classical Philology

VOLUME IX

January 1914

NUMBER 1

## DRAMATIC "SATURA"

By B. L. ULLMAN

The present paper aims to supplement a previous paper on the history and uses of the word *satura*,<sup>1</sup> by taking up the one portion of the subject there untouched, viz., the application of the word *satura* to dramatic performances.<sup>2</sup> The discussion centers about the

<sup>1</sup> *Class. Phil.*, VIII, 172. It may not be out of place to add a note on two points. Professor Prescott calls my attention to the fact that *satur* is passive in force and thus *satura* would mean "stuffed things," and not, as I assume on p. 174, "stuffing." I should perhaps have discussed this point, though I felt at the time that the close analogy of *fartum* and Italian *ripieno* made explanation unnecessary. We know now, it is true, that Plautus used *fartis* in the two places where older editions read *fartum*, but the form *fartum* is found in Columella, *de arb.* 21. 2 (ed. Lundström, 1897). That there are no earlier examples I consider of no significance—words of this meaning are naturally rare in the extant literature. The explanation of *satura* and *fartum* is that there can be no sharp differentiation between active and passive in words meaning "full"; we say "a full ship" and "a full cargo." Cf. *conserta turba* (Livy 39.49.9), but *domus turba referta* (Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.137). Virgil says *saturo colore* (*G.* 4.335); Seneca, *vestes saturae Tyrio ostro* (*Thy.* 956). We read of *messes saturae* (*Aetna* 12) and *cibi pleniore* (more "filling" foods: *Cels.* 3.20).

In support of the suggestion on p. 193 that the phrase "libri per saturam" came into use in the third century A.D., it should be noted that this century marks the revival of the expression "per saturam." After being in common use in the second century B.C., we do not find that it was used again (except by the archaizers Sallust and Fronto) until the third century A.D., from which time on it becomes fairly common again.

<sup>2</sup> Hendrickson's article in *AJP*, XV, 1 has been responsible for the great interest in the subject in America. The latest detailed treatment is by Lejay in his edition of Horace's *Satires* (1911), pp. lxxxiii f. I did not see Michaut's extensive treatment (*Sur les tréteaux latins*, 1912) until this paper was completed. On some points we are in agreement, and these he puts excellently well, but his interpretations of some matters are impossible. His general conclusion is something like that of Schanz.

famous passage in Livy (7. 2). Those who have recently dealt with the passage from the standpoint of satire have assumed that Livy's account is a history of Roman comedy. As a matter of fact we are dealing with the history of the drama—both tragedy and comedy. This is not only clear from the analysis which follows, but nothing else is possible when we consider that Livy is describing the origin and development of the scenic games, including as they did both comedy and tragedy.<sup>1</sup>

The stages of development, according to Livy, were as follows: (1) *sine carmine ullo, sine imitandorum carminum actu, ludiones, ex Etruria acciti, ad tibicinis modos saltantes, haud indecoros motus more Tusco dabant* (§ 4): professionals from Etruria danced to the accompaniment of the flute. The dances were evidently religious, with no element of humor.<sup>2</sup> (2) *imitari deinde eos iuventus simul inconditis inter se iocularia fundentes versibus coepere, nec absoni a voce motus erant. accepta itaque res saepiusque usurpando excitata* (§§ 5, 6): amateurs imitated the Etruscan dancers and banded coarse jokes made up on the spur of the moment in alternating verses (§ 7), to the accompaniment of the flute. As their motions harmonized with their words ("nec absoni a voce"), and thus contrasted with the "haud indecoros motus" of the Etruscans, the performance was evidently a burlesque. It met with such favor that it was kept up as a regular institution. (3) *vernaculis artificibus, quia ister Tusco verbo ludio vocabatur, nomen histrionibus inditum; qui non, sicut ante, Fescennino versu similem incompositum temere ac rudem alternis iaciebant, sed impletas modis saturas descripto iam ad tibicinem cantu motuque congruenti peragebant* (§§ 6, 7): professionals sang songs whose music (melody and flute accompaniment) and words had been composed beforehand, and danced—very similar to the

<sup>1</sup> Leo sees that Livy's account is a history of the drama, but insists that not one word need refer to tragedy (*Hermes*, 39, 70): "Livius dagegen stellt die Geschichte des Dramas in der Weise dar, dass nicht ein Wort auf die Tragödie bezogen werden muss. Das Ganze könnte, wie es ist, in einen Tractat *περὶ κωμῳδίας* umgesetzt werden." This is true, but does not necessitate assuming that Livy's account was taken *in toto* from a history of Greek comedy. Hendrickson goes a step farther and assumes that the account includes comedy only.

<sup>2</sup> Körting, *Gesch. d. griech. u. röm. Theaters*, 229, "Aus dem Anlasse, weshalb die Etrusker berufen wurden, möchte man auf einen ernsten Charakter ihrer Kunstleistung schliessen."

songs at a modern vaudeville performance. (4) *Livius post aliquot annis, qui ab saturis ausus est primus argumento fabulam serere, idem scilicet, id quod omnes tum erant, suorum carminum actor, dicitur, cum saepius revocatus vocem obtudisset, venia petita puerum ad canendum ante tibicinem cum statuisset, canticum egisse aliquanto magis vigente motu, quia nihil vocis usus impediēbat. inde ad manum cantari histrionibus coeptum, diverbiaque tantum ipsorum voci relicta* (§§ 8-10): Livius began to write plays—which means that the entertainment at any one performance was of a unified character, there was an organic relation between the parts of it, i.e., there was a plot—quite different from the vaudeville bills that had been offered before his time. (5) *postquam lege hac fabularum ab risu ac soluto ioco res avocabatur et ludus in artem paulatim verterat, iuventus histrionibus fabellarum actu relicto ipsa inter se more antiquo ridicula intexta versibus iactilare coepit; quae exodia postea appellata consertaque fabellis potissimum Atellanis sunt. quod genus ludorum ab Oscis acceptum tenuit iuventus nec ab histrionibus pollui passa est: eo institutum manet, ut actores Atellanarum nec tribu moveantur et stipendia, tamquam expertes artis ludicae, faciant* (§§ 11, 12): the amateurs went back to their old-time joking, burlesquing the new style of drama as they had burlesqued the Etruscan dancers. After a while these burlesques were incorporated with the *Atellanae*, and were given as after-plays. This time the amateurs did not allow their performances to be "polluted" by professionals.

Before proceeding to a detailed interpretation of the passage, it is necessary to pass in review certain opinions that have been held about it, in order to appreciate the fact that tradition has been responsible for the retention of erroneous views, from which it has been very difficult for scholars to free themselves. It must be remembered that the questions involved have been actively discussed since the fifteenth century. It has not always been discovered that statements taken for granted were originally based on assumptions afterward disproved.

It will be noticed that no distinctive name is applied to any stage till we come to the *satura*. It was chiefly this fact that led readers of Livy to give but slight importance to the *iocularia* and to class them with the performances of the Etruscan dancers

mentioned first. It was assumed that both performances took place only once—in the year 364 B.C. This assumption involved the further one that the words “accepta . . . excitata” are to be taken with what follows. The words of § 11 (“ab risu ac soluto ioco”) also were instrumental in causing a wrong impression. They were taken to refer to the *saturae*, and, since the following words clearly alluded to the *iocularia*, the *saturae* were supposed to be merely a form of *iocularia* somewhat elaborated after the first performance in 364, and thus the first two stages in the history of the drama were ignored. The *satura* was thought to be a combination of the Etruscan pantomime and the native Fescennine verses. The words “sicut ante” were understood to refer to the Fescennine verses as they were before 364 B.C., according to Horace’s description. This seems to be practically the attitude of Casaubon<sup>1</sup> (though it is not easy to determine just what he meant), who has had a very strong influence on succeeding scholars. At any rate, Casaubon considered the *iocularia* of comparatively little importance. In the early part of his book (p. 3), he divides the formative period of poetry into three parts, following Aristotle, *φύσις, αὐτοσχεδιάσματα, τέχνη*. The Fescennine verses belong to the *αὐτοσχεδιάσματα* (p. 235). In speaking of Livy’s account, he classes the *iocularia* under the same head, and says that the *saturae* grew out of the *iocularia* as the *λαμβεῖα* out of the *αὐτοσχεδιάσματα* (p. 237). Since in the early part of his book (p. 16) he had mentioned the *λαμβεῖα* merely as variations of the *αὐτοσχεδιάσματα*, it is evident that he did not distinguish sharply between *iocularia* and *saturae*, and, therefore, took it for granted that the characteristics of the former passed over into the latter. Hence it is that he assumes that the *exodia* grew out of the *saturae* (into which he supposed the transitory *iocularia* had merged), and by the words *appellatione versuum* he refers to the word *versibus* used by Livy in § 5, instead of overlooking the word, as Hendrickson (p. 9, n. 2) thought. Hendrickson has quite mistaken Casaubon’s position.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I. Casaubonus, *De satyrica Graecorum poesi, et Romanorum satira libri duo*, Paris, 1605.

<sup>2</sup> Dacier (Introduction to his edition of Horace, *Serm.*), followed closely by Dryden in his *Essay on Satire*, seems to hold Casaubon’s view, though he (and Dryden after him) makes a curious mistake. He appears to say that the Fescennines were in



It was an easy step from this position to imagine that the *iocularia* were themselves *saturae*. Such, for example, was the thought of Rigaltius.<sup>1</sup> Even the Etruscan performances of the year 364 B.C. were included among the *saturae* by some, an idea which has persisted until this day.<sup>2</sup> Finally the term *satura* was applied to performances preceding even the appearance of the Etruscans in 364.<sup>3</sup> The first of these interpretations (the one that Casaubon gives) has been adopted by many scholars, among them apparently by Leo in his first article (*Hermes*, 24, 67). Livy's words in § 11 make this interpretation impossible: the *iuventus* began to bandy *ridicula more antiquo*, which can refer only to the *iocularia*. If this was a *mos antiquus*, it must have lasted more than the one year 364. Hence the words of § 6, "accepta . . . excitata," must belong to the description of the *iocularia*.<sup>4</sup>

The second interpretation, that the *iocularia* too were *saturae*, was developed and justified and had a large vogue in the nineteenth century. It had the useful result of emphasizing the importance of the *iocularia*. It was thought that there were two kinds of *satura*; the first, plain *satura*, and the second, "impleta modis *satura*." This was evidently Jahn's belief (*Hermes*, 2, 225) when he said that the *iuventus* performed "die formlose *satura*." The "impleta modis

vogue during the 120 years immediately preceding 364 B.C. The number 120 he seems to have gotten by subtracting 240 (Livius Andronicus) from 364—performing the school-boy trick of confusing "B.C." and "A.D." reckoning.

<sup>1</sup> *Dissertatio de satyra Juvenalis*, reprinted in Henninius' Juvenal: "iocularia primum . . . mox dieteria . . . satiras vocitabant," etc.

<sup>2</sup> Duff, *Literary History of Rome*, 2d ed. (1910), 82: "In the consulship of Sulpicius and Stolo (see below, p. 12, n. 2) Etruscan performers were introduced into Rome . . . Their performances he [Livy] calls *saturae*."

<sup>3</sup> It is not clear whether Mommsen (quoted below, p. 15, n. 3) had this idea or not. At any rate Ribbeck (*Röm. Trag.* 21) thought he did, and accepted the supposed suggestion. Rasi (*Iudicia quae de sat. Lat. orig.*, etc. [1886], 21 f.) followed this lead and had an elaborate scheme of a series of periods in the history of *satura*—the early period (previous to 364), the period mentioned by Livy (364–240), etc.

<sup>4</sup> See also below, p. 7. I cannot explain Leo's attitude in his second paper (*Hermes*, 39, 67). He tacitly accepts Hendrickson's argument that the *iuventus* went back to the *iocularia*, not to the *saturae*, by saying "die *iuventus* kehren ihrerseits zu den alten Scherzspielen zurück," but, as in his first paper (*Hermes*, 24, 77), he takes the words "accepta . . . excitata" with the description which follows concerning the *saturae*.

*satura*” was “kunstmässig.”<sup>1</sup> The objection to this point of view is that Livy does not apply the name *satura* to the *iocularia*, and further that the two performances were quite dissimilar, as we shall see. Friedrich<sup>2</sup> defends the view that *satura* applies also to the *iocularia* by the assumption that Livy has condensed his source so greatly and so unintelligently that he has failed to attribute the term *satura* to the *iocularia*. But we have no right to go back of Livy merely to bolster up a mistaken interpretation. Using Friedrich’s method we might argue that the *satura* was a *fabula* (as neither he nor I believe, see below, p. 7), and in fact prove almost anything. Friedrich adduces the glosses *ludo σατυριστης* and *σατυριστης ο σκινηκος ludio* to support his position. He should also have quoted Dion. Hal. vii. 72 (see below). But *σατυριστης* is a pure Greek word, meaning a burlesque dancer (hence equivalent to *ludio*), and having no connection with Latin *satura* (see below, p. 22, n. 2). Jung,<sup>3</sup> following Petermann,<sup>4</sup> explains (?) that Livy omits *satura* in speaking of the *iocularia* for the sake of variety! We must lay the blame for the many errors about Livy’s words not merely on his obscurity, but partly, at least, on the disturbing influence of the word *satura*, familiar to us in a different connection, and on our natural tendency to group together all pre-Andronican drama. The interpretation that I have given, so far as the relation of *iocularia*, *saturae*, and *exodia* is concerned, was first suggested, so far as I know, by Heinrich, in his edition of Juvenal (1839, pp. 4, 6). But it was left to Hendrickson to give a full discussion of this most important point. It is undoubtedly due to his presentation that succeeding writers have tacitly accepted this point of view.

Returning to the direct examination of Livy’s words, we note that Livy says, “To professionals, because the Etruscan word for dancer was *ister*, the name *histriones* was given; who did not bandy verses as before, but produced *saturae*,” where we should expect,

<sup>1</sup> Thus Jahn and Fritzsche have been misunderstood by Hendrickson (p. 8, n. 2; p. 12, n. 1), who failed to get Jahn’s meaning because the other interpretation seemed so obvious to him.

<sup>2</sup> *Z. Gesch. d. röm. Sat.*, 7.

<sup>3</sup> *De satira rom.*, 4.

<sup>4</sup> *Ueber d. Ursprung d. röm. Sat.*

"Professionals, to whom the name *histriones* was given because . . . , no longer banded . . . but produced *saturae*." The reason for Livy's unusual order is that he is more interested in giving the etymology of *histrion* than in tracing the step of development. We should expect, furthermore, a word like *deinde*.<sup>1</sup> Thus the words "*accepta . . . excitata*" belong with what precedes, as we saw also above. All this is not only important in itself, but has a bearing on our next point.

"*Impletas modis saturas*," says Livy. This has caused more trouble than any other phrase in the passage. One would expect "*saturas modis impletas*." As a result many have taken *satura* as covering the preceding stage as well. Hendrickson has shown the impossibility of this, but he has given no sufficient reason for the prominence of "*impletas modis*." Others<sup>2</sup> have given the undoubtedly correct one—Livy is etymologizing: he is thinking of the adjective *satur* as equivalent to *impletus*. The development of the drama is obscured by Livy for the sake of the etymology, exactly as in the still more striking case that we have just noted. Another indication that Livy is etymologizing is the fact that "*impletas modis*," though in an important place in the sentence, adds nothing at all to the characterization of the *satura*<sup>3</sup>—provided we take the phrase correctly. Some have tried to force a meaning into it in order to obviate the difficulty.<sup>4</sup> But in view of the context and of the use of the word in § 4, *modis* can refer only to the rhythmical strains of the flute—in fact, had Livy not needed a word with *impletas* for the sake of his etymology, he could well have used the language of § 4 and said

<sup>1</sup> So, too, Weissenborn in his commentary on *post aliquot annis* (§ 8).

<sup>2</sup> Birt, *Zwei pol. Sat. d. alten Rom*, 17, n. 2 (apparently following Krahner, *Zeitschr. f. d. Alt.*, X [1852], 394); Webb, *Class. Phil.*, VII, 184, who cites also Heinrich, *Juvenal* (1839), II, 5.

<sup>3</sup> Leo unconsciously illustrates the point when he paraphrases Livy thus (*Hermes*, 24, 77): "*Sie führen 'saturae' auf, die nach Melodie, Begleitung und Tanzbewegung kunstmässig componirt sind.*" Where is "*impletas modis*"?

<sup>4</sup> Lejay (*op. cit.*): "*dialogues de mètres variés*" (p. lxxxiv); "*un progrès marqué dans la versification; la variété des mélodies impliquant celle des mètres (impletas modis s'opposant à Fescennino versu).*" This interpretation makes the *saturae* similar to the *dixerbia* of *fabulae*. That this is impossible will appear in the following discussion.

"saturas descripto iam ad tibicinis modos cantu," instead of "ad tibicinem cantu."<sup>1</sup>

Then came Livius "qui ab saturis ausus est primus argumento fabulam serere." Here again some scholars have been misled. As *argumento* precedes *fabulam*, it seems to introduce the new idea, i.e., *fabulam* has no emphasis. Therefore, as before, some have thought that *fabula* applied also to the stage preceding, i.e., that the *saturae*, too, were *fabulae*. Now the method of expression is just like that in "impletas modis saturas"—the word that introduces the new idea is not put first where we should expect it. The reason again is that Livy is etymologizing, though it is not so apparent here as in the case of *satura*, and thus seems to have escaped notice. Livy is trying to suggest why a play should be called a *fabula*. The word is obviously derived from *fari*,<sup>2</sup> "to say," closely akin to *arguo*, "to assert, reveal." In fact, *argumentum* and *fabula* are practically synonymous in this passage, as Weissenborn's examples clearly show, though, strangely enough, he does not use them in elucidating the passage. Quintilian says (v. 10. 9): "fabulae ad actum scaenarum compositae argumenta dicuntur," but stronger than Quintilian's are Livy's own words. In 38. 12. 7 we find "nocturno hoc ficto et composito argumento," and in 38. 12. 9 the same circumstance is referred to as "fabulam huius noctis," and again in 38. 15. 1 as "nocturna fabula." On *argumentum* as used here Weissenborn says: "wie der Stoff, die Fabel zu einer Drama." In 3. 44. 9, "notam iudici fabulam petitor, quippe apud ipsum auctorem argumenti, peragit," *argumentum* is used merely as a variation for *fabula*.<sup>3</sup> Thus Livy adds nothing by using *argumento*,<sup>4</sup> no more than he did with *impletas modis*.<sup>5</sup> *Argumento* merely explains the meaning of *fabulam*.

<sup>1</sup> "Ad tibicinem cantu" are naturally taken together as "song with flute accompaniment." Cf. Cic. *De leg.* ii. 62, "cantus ad tibicinem"; cf. *Thes. ling. lat.*, I, 527, 5a.

<sup>2</sup> Varro, *L. L.* vi. 55, "ab eodem verbo fari fabulae, ut tragoediae et comoediae, dictae."

<sup>3</sup> *Serere* is equivalent to *componere*; cf. 38. 56. 8, "alia tota serenda fabula est"; 3. 10. 10, "fabulam compositam"; also 38. 12. 7 and Quintilian cited above.

<sup>4</sup> Similarly Aristotle, *Poetics* 1449b. 8, λόγους καὶ μῦθους, where Vahlen, as Professor Hendrickson reminds me, explains καὶ as epexegetical. Bywater translates "Fables or Plots."

<sup>5</sup> It is worth noting that Valerius Maximus (ii. 4. 4.), paraphrasing Livy, saw not only that neither *satura* nor *fabula* included the preceding stages in Livy's account,

In examining Livy's account, we see that its author was very anxious to tie together closely the various stages of development in order to form a logical scheme—so anxious as to create suspicion: he "protests too much." We are thus led to study the ways in which the account is knitted together. It is to be noted that in the description of the first stage the emphasis is on the thought that the performance was not accompanied by song. There evidently is a strong contrast between this state of affairs and something else: what this is appears in the description of the second stage ("iocularia fundentes versibus . . . nec absoni a voce motus"). But this is hardly enough. It is truly striking that Livy should start his account with a statement describing what the performance was *not* like. It is hard to believe that this is done merely to indicate the connection with the following stage, which, as *imitari* shows, is so obviously dependent upon the first. The negative statement of which we are speaking looks farther ahead—to the *satura*, and is balanced by the description of the *satura*: "descripto iam ad tibicinem cantu motuque congruenti." *Iam* marks not merely a contrast between *descripto* and what precedes, but the culmination of the development, looks back, in other words, to the expression *sine carmine*, etc. But some may think that this is over-refining; yet we can point to an attempt to connect the first and third stages about which there can be no doubt: Livy applies the term *histriones* to the *satura* players and at the same time defines the word as Etruscan—in fact, as we have seen, the emphasis rests entirely on this definition. There remains one more clause descriptive of the *satura*, and this connects the *satura* with the stage just preceding; in reality, it merely states what the *satura* was *not* like, and the words used describe perfectly the second stage, as was intended to be indicated by *sicut ante*. This phrase effectively ties together the two stages, but, in the desire to accomplish the juncture, the truth had to be somewhat twisted, for the literal interpretation of "qui non sicut ante" would make it appear that the *iuventus* were professionals and were called *histriones*.

but also that *impletas modis* and *argumento* had the same function in their respective clauses, for he reproduces Livy's idea by the phrases "ad saturarum modos" and "ad fabularum argumenta."

N.B. Is all this connecting tissue justified? Did the *satura* really develop from the *iocularia* of the amateurs? Let us see in what respects the two were similar and different. Both consisted of singing, dancing, and flute accompaniment—truly a very broad and general similarity. If there was dancing there was bound to be musical accompaniment, and this of course meant the *tibia* in early Roman days. If there was singing, the gestures or dancing of course were in keeping with the songs—and it is this perfectly obvious detail that Livy lays stress on in his very brief sketch. The differences that are made prominent—the acting of amateurs in the one case and of professionals in the other, and the rough improvisation on the one hand as against the more artistic form on the other—are those that would most readily suggest that the *satura* grew out of the *iocularia* of the amateurs. But a far more important difference is to be inferred from Livy's words, though it is given less prominence. The phrase *alternis iaciebant* contrasts with *peragebant*. The singing in the *satura*, then, was continuous, not responsive.<sup>1</sup> This fundamental difference shows that there was no actual relation between the two performances. The one that Livy puts earlier had in it more dramatic possibilities than the other.

What, then, was the nature of the *satura*? It consisted of singing and dancing to flute accompaniment. Now it has been said by others that in section 11 we have a characterization of the *saturae*: "postquam . . . verterat."<sup>2</sup> But it is clear that Livy is thinking of the whole development of the drama from the time of the performances of the *iuventus* on,<sup>3</sup> as his next words show ("iuventus . . . coepit"). He is contrasting the artistic drama with the rude attempts of the amateurs. Besides, by *paulatim* he would seem to indicate the progress made by the *saturae*. Thus the phrase "*risu ac soluto*

<sup>1</sup> Whether Livy meant that the *histriones* performed in chorus or singly seems impossible to decide.

<sup>2</sup> It is generally assumed that "lege hac fabularum" refers to the separation of singing and acting mentioned just before, but, since this is too absurd even for Livy, I would suggest that *fabularum* is a genitive of definition or apposition, a construction which is common in Livy. "By this law, viz., by regular plays with plots," says Livy, "the artistic drama was developed."

<sup>3</sup> I do not of course mean to imply that the *saturae* were thought of as *fabulae*. Cf. Hendrickson, p. 27, who, however, causes confusion by referring to p. 5, n. 2, from which one gets the opposite impression. Cf. Knapp, *AJP*, 33, 145.

ioeo" would take its place with *iocularia* and *ridicula* (it will not escape notice that it is etymologically equivalent to these two words) as a description of the second stage, not of the third or *satura* stage. This leads one to the thought that the *saturae* were not necessarily comic at all. Such a performance might often be comic, at other times serious, or at least sentimental. To be sure, most of such performances could be classed under comedy in the ancient sense. Looked at from the standpoint of the *fabulae*, the *saturae* might well be called a series of *cantica*. The *satura* would thus bear no more actual relation to the burlesques by the amateurs than the *fabula* bore to the *satura*. The *fabulae* of Andronicus are certainly meant by Livy to include tragedies—the first occasion on which Andronicus produced plays, he produced a comedy and a tragedy.<sup>1</sup> It has even been suggested that Livy's account of the separation of the dancing and singing in the *cantica* applied only to tragedy.<sup>2</sup>

To sum up the relation between the four stages represented by the Etruscan dances, the *iocularia*, the *saturae*, and the *fabulae*, it is clear that the first two belong together, that Livy has tried to make it appear that the *saturae* were closely related to the *iocularia*, whereby he has obscured his meaning, and that, as a matter of fact, what he describes as the *satura* is more closely related to the *fabula*. It is worth while diagramming this to make it clear. The letters indicate the four stages of development.

The left-hand diagram indicates the rough grouping of the raw material, so to speak; the right-hand diagram, the grouping after Livy (or his source) had seen the necessity of bringing together the two pairs and had done so all too well, with the result that the pairs have been broken up:



<sup>1</sup> Some believe that a tragedy alone was produced (e.g., Plessis, *La poésie latine*, 3). Cf. Weissenborn's note on the words "fabellarum actu": "die gesamte Darstellung der eigentlichen Theaterstücke, Komödien wie Tragödien." See below, on *exodia*, p. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Reisch, in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie*, III, 1497, s. v. "canticum": "Auch war sie [die Teilung] vielleicht auf Cantica der Tragödien beschränkt, die in ihrer recitativen Durchföhrung grössere Anforderungen an die Gesangkunst stellten und gleichzeitig ein lebhaftes Geberdenspiel erheischen."



As to the *exodia*, it seems very unlikely that amateurs presented *Atellanae* and followed these with *exodia*, as one interpretation has it. In the first place, Livy's language naturally implies that the *exodia* were *Atellanae*—for the words “*tenuit iuventus*,” said of the *Atellanae*, must refer to the *exodia* too, because of the repetition of the word *iuventus* in a casual way (it had just been used in connection with the *exodia*) and the emphatic statement that the *iuventus* clung to the *Atellanae* and did not allow them to be polluted by the professional actors—obviously in contrast with the driving out of the amateurs by the professional producers of the *satura* and *fabula*. In the second place, the *exodia* and the *Atellanae* were both burlesques. For the *exodia* we need only remember that they were revivals of the *iocularia*, and that these were burlesque dances, as we saw above. It is well known that the *Atellanae* were sometimes burlesques. In the third place, the prefix *con-* in *consero* naturally indicates the combination or blending of two things into one (as we distinguish between “cohesion” and “adhesion”). Now what did these *exodia Atellanica* burlesque? Naturally the dramas of Andronicus, judging from Livy's words: “Andronicus was the first to write plays with plots; the amateurs, *leaving the acting of plays to the professionals*, returned to their burlesquing.” The *exodia Atellanica* then were burlesques of, and after-plays to, the tragedies of Livius and his successors.<sup>1</sup> It is no wonder then that the ancients likened the *Atellana* to the Greek satyr-drama—and, in doing so, caused all the modern discussion of Livy's words.

Can we determine what basis of fact there was for Livy's résumé of pre-Andronican drama, and how it was pieced together? That Etruscan players performed at Rome for the first time in 364 B.C., as Livy reports, is confirmed by Plutarch's citation of Cluvius Rufus, a reputable historian of Nero's time.<sup>2</sup> Plutarch, however, implies

<sup>1</sup> Thus we have another indication that Livy was thinking of the drama, not comedy alone. Perhaps, however, a *palliata* was sometimes burlesqued (cf. Leo, *Hermes*, 24, 84, n. 1).

<sup>2</sup> *Quaest. rom.* 107. The nature of the differences between Plutarch and Livy makes it probable that Rufus was following a source independent of Livy's. Tacitus (*Ann.* 14. 21: “*a Tuscis accitos histriones*”) is perhaps following Livy. Festus (326) is not at variance with Livy as to the date, as Hendrickson (*AJP*, XIX, 299) says, perhaps misled by the condensed form of statement in Teuffel's *Hist. of Rom. Lit.*, § 6. 3. Festus states that <Ati>lius and Popilius were the aediles who held the first

that there were Roman actors before that time. Since the Etruscan dancers were called *histriones* in their own language, their performance would naturally seem to be a suitable starting-point for a history of the histrionic art.

To get further light on the basis for Livy's tale we must consider the nature of the *ludi Romani*, at which the early scenic games were produced. The most important feature of the *ludi* in early days was the racing of chariots in the Circus. But there were other shows in the Circus, secondary in importance, to be sure; of these the scenic performances were at first a part, the first stage, indeed, being erected in the Circus.<sup>1</sup> The *ludi* at first lasted only one day, but on various occasions a day at a time was added. The chariot-racing, however, was for a long time confined to but one day, and so the other days must have been given over to unofficial games and entertainments.<sup>2</sup> That these were popular is indicated by the constant addition to the number of days, a total of four being already reached in 367. When three years later a pestilence broke out in Rome, the authorities took advantage of the popularity of some of these performances to divert the minds of the populace under the pretense of appeasing the gods:<sup>3</sup> they gave official recognition to these performances, engaged professional actors from Etruria as a special attraction,<sup>4</sup> and built a stage for their use. Now, preceding the Circus games there was always a grand procession (*pompa*) from the Capitol into the Circus. In this the charioteers and other

games. These men were consuls (not aediles) in 359 and may well have been aediles in 364. Cruttwell (*Hist. of Rom. Lit.*, 29) also makes the mistake of taking the aedileship for the consulship. Another mistake as to the date is made by Duff (*Lit. Hist. of Rome*, 82) who puts the introduction of Etruscans in the year 389 B.C., by a confusion of A.U.C. and B.C. Finally, Fowler makes it 349 (see below, n. 3)!

<sup>1</sup> Livy, 7. 3. Cf. Friedländer in Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsver.*, 2d ed., III, 529.

<sup>2</sup> So Mommsen, *Rom. Hist.* (1908), II, 97, who suggests that "the multitude were probably left mainly to furnish amusement for themselves, although musicians, dancers, rope-walkers, jugglers, jesters and such like would not fail to make their appearance on the occasion, whether hired or not."

<sup>3</sup> Similar methods were often used. Cf. Fowler, *The Religious Experience of the Rom. People* (1911), 263: "in the similar trouble of 349 [should be 364] B.C. recourse was had for the first time to *ludi scenici* in order to amuse the people. In the history of the Hannibalic war we shall have plenty of opportunity of noting this kind of expedient."

<sup>4</sup> It was natural to send to Etruria, whence the *pompa* probably came (see below, p. 22, n. 1).

official performers took part, and it is evident that the actors too must have participated as soon as their performances were officially recognized. Dionysius of Halicarnassus has left us a description of the *pompa*, citing Fabius Pictor as his authority (vii. 72). The particular *pompa* that he describes purports to be the one that took place at the first celebration of the *ludi Romani*, according to his account, in 496 B.C. Of course no one will believe this; on the other hand it is not safe to assume that it represents the *pompa* as it was when Fabius wrote. He naturally would recall what he had heard from his elders concerning the *pompa* of their youth. This would carry us to the first part of the third century B.C. We have, in fact, an indication of this in Dionysius' statement that the appropriation for the games was not increased till the Punic Wars.

In this *pompa* the sons of Roman citizens took part on horse and foot, followed by the charioteers, riders and other contestants, then bands of dancers arranged in three divisions, according to age, and attended by flute- and cithara-players, then bands of actors burlesquing and ridiculing the dancers, they, too, being accompanied (in a double sense) by musicians. Behind these came the specifically religious part of the procession.

It has been seen<sup>1</sup> that the mounted boys at the head of the procession were those who took part in the *Ludus Troiae* in the Circus. The boys on foot perhaps produced in the Circus what was afterward known as the *pyrrhicha militaris* or *armatura*.<sup>2</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> Mommsen, *Rom. Hist.* (1908), I, 294, n.; Friedländer, *op. cit.*, 526.

<sup>2</sup> Friedländer, *op. cit.*, 527. It is alluded to by Livy 44.9 for the year 169 B.C. Evidently Dionysius again refers to this performance in ii. 71, where he compares it to the dancing of the *Salii* (see below, p. 16, n. 1) and gives the performers the designation *λυδῖνες*, which word he derives from *λυδολ*. It seems not to have been noticed that the gloss, *CGL*, III, 289. 59, *κουρηταις ludiones*, was probably taken from this passage in Dionysius. That *ludio* (or *ludius*) was used specifically of these young men appears to be attested by Pl. *Aul.* 402, "volsus ludius" and Cic. *De har. resp.* 11. 23 (describing the *pompa*), "si ludius constitit." The term was applied to other circus dancers as well: Livy 7. 2, Val. Max. ii. 4. 4, Ov. *Ars am.* i. 112, perhaps Suet. *Aug.* 74, possibly the glosses (see below, p. 15, n. 2), and Festus p. 326 (as emended by Mommsen, *R. St.*, I, 482. 2). The *Luperci* too were known as *ludii* (Tertull. *De spect.* 5, giving Varro as his authority). In Cic. *Sest.* 116, *ludius* is used as a broad term of anyone participating in a *ludus*, even a spectator. It is used of any performer in Livy 39. 6 and Apul. *Flor.* 18. *Ludius* is the commoner form; *ludio* is found in Dion. Hal., Livy (three times), Apul., and the glosses. Val. Max., who copied Livy, changed from *ludio* to *ludius*. *Ludia* (Mart. v. 24. 10; Juv. 6. 104, 266) is a woman who frequents the gladiatorial *ludus*.

charioteers and other contestants were in the procession because they were to take part in the Circus games. What of the dancers and those who burlesqued them? Surely their part was not ended with the disbanding of the procession. Evidently the real performance began in the Circus, and their evolutions and antics during the parade were merely by way of anticipation.<sup>1</sup>

As soon as we see that the *pompa* was not something entirely apart from the Circus performances, it becomes apparent that we have in Dionysius a welcome substantiation<sup>2</sup> of Livy's account of the first two stages of the history of the drama.<sup>3</sup> Let us consider some questions raised by the two accounts. Whether Etruscan dancers were used again after their first appearance in 364, we do not know. At any rate we may be certain that, for the most part, the authorities availed themselves of domestic talent, and we need not be surprised that Dionysius says nothing of Etruscans. That

<sup>1</sup> That even the actors of regular plays took part in the procession as long as the scenic games were held in the Circus (as was true of the performances produced at the *ludi Romani*, at least, down to the second century A.C. Cf. Friedländer, *op. cit.*, 529 f.) is likely in itself and is perhaps indicated by Valerius Maximus (i. 1. 16), who says that Varro lost the battle of Cannae because he used a *puer histrio* in the *pompa*, whereas the law required a *puer patrimus et matrimus*. As the procession was about to start Varro probably noticed that he lacked a boy, and catching sight of a good-looking young actor in the ranks just ahead, he commandeered him to fill the gap. When plays were presented in theaters there was a separate *pompa* (Tertull. *De spect.* 10) and very likely the actors marched in it.

<sup>2</sup> The glosses seem to confirm this: *ludo* (for *ludio*) *σατυριστῆς* (CGL, II, 124. 47) and *σατυριστῆς ο σκιρῆτος ludio* (CGL, II, 430. 2). The glossaries from which these are taken were formed by using Greek and Latin versions of the same work (cf. *Class. Phil.*, VIII, 179 and Bannier in *Philologus*, LXI, 238). That this work dealt with Roman matters is shown by the use of *ludio*. Some more common word would have been chosen if the Latin were a version and not the original. *σατυριστῆς* is the word used by Dionysius of the burlesque dancers. Since *ludio* points to the Circus (see above, p. 14, n. 2), it would seem that the glossographer's original spoke of the very performances mentioned by Livy and Dionysius.

<sup>3</sup> Not till I had drawn my own conclusions did I notice that Mommsen evidently held the view just propounded as to the relation of Livy and Dionysius (*Rom. Hist.* [1908], I, 35): "The simplest elements of art are in Latium and Hellas quite the same; the decorous armed dance, the "leap" (triumpus, *θρίαμβος*, *δι-θόραμβος*); the masquerade of the "full people" (*σάτυροι*, *satura*), who wrapped in the skins of sheep and goats . . ." The reference to the sheep and goats is taken from Dionysius (cf. Mommsen, 285-86). Mommsen, however, held the mistaken, though common, view that the burlesques of the *iuventus* described by Livy were included under the term *satura* (see above, p. 5). It is not clear whether Ribbeck, who elaborated on Mommsen's suggestion or supposed (cf. above, p. 5, n. 3) suggestion, knew that Mommsen's suggestion was derived entirely from Dionysius.

the dances might change gradually on account of the use of Roman or Romanized actors and become more Roman in character seems rather likely. Hence we can understand why the dance that Dionysius describes bears considerable similarity to the dances of the *Salii*, priests of Mars. There are the divisions into groups according to age (three, however, as against the two of the *Salii*), the use of weapons, the purple garments, the presence of a leader to indicate the figures.<sup>1</sup> For the burlesque feature of the Circensian *pompa*, Dionysius cites parallels from the triumphal and funeral processions. That the parallelism was not a mere fancy is indicated by the striking similarity between Livy's description of the stage burlesques by the *iuventus* and his descriptions of the soldiers' songs in the triumphal processions.<sup>2</sup> The Circus *pompa* was, in fact, a development of the triumphal *pompa*.<sup>3</sup>

Thanks to Dionysius, then, we may be confident that the burlesques mentioned by Livy actually existed. We learn too that the serious dances (originally given by Etruscans) continued to exist by the side of the burlesques which imitated them—and, after all, this might have been inferred from Livy, for it is not likely that a burlesque performance would persist, unless the thing burlesqued also persisted. Finally, we can infer that both of these stage performances remained in vogue for some time.<sup>4</sup>

As for the *saturae* of Livy's tale, we are not so certain of their existence. On the one hand, nothing could be more probable than the existence of such song-and-dance exhibitions. On the other

<sup>1</sup> Dionysius (ii. 71) compares the very similar evolutions of the young men (see above, p. 14 and n. 2) to the dances of the *Salii*. He applies the term *ludiones* to the young men, as Livy does to the Etruscans. Ovid (*Ars am.* i. 112), following Livy or a similar account, says that the "*ludius aequatam ter pede pulsat humum*," reminding one of the *tripudium* of the *Salii*. In vii. 72 Dionysius compares the performance of the three divisions of dancers to the Greek *pyrrhicha*, a term applied to the manoeuvres of the young Romans, as we saw above (p. 14), all of which goes to show that the dancing of the Salian priests, the Roman cadets, and the professional players was all of a piece. The Salian dances may of course have come under Etruscan influence.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. especially, 5. 49. 7: "*iocos . . . inconditos iaciunt*"; 4. 53. 11: "*alternis inconditi versus iactati*." See Schanz, *Gesch. d. röm. Litt.*, I, 1 (3d ed.), p. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Friedländer, *op. cit.*, 508.

<sup>4</sup> It may be well to add that my interpretation of Livy in the foregoing pages has not been made to fit Dionysius. My treatment of Livy's account was complete, in fact, written out, before I saw the bearing of Dionysius' words.

hand, we have no confirming evidence,<sup>1</sup> and their existence may have been inferred from practices common in the writer's own day. According to Livy, a *fabula* consists of two divisions, *cantica* and *diverbia*. We have seen that the *saturae* may be described as *cantica*. Thus Andronicus' advance was supposed to consist in adding the connecting plot of words (*argumentum*=*fabula*=*diverbia*) to the songs (*impletae modis saturae*=*cantica*). Given the terms *cantica* and *diverbia*, it was natural to assume that in an earlier stage only one of these existed. The author of our account may have argued that the *cantica* were the earlier because the Andronican form of drama, though containing both, was named *fabula* on account of the *diverbia*; that, therefore, the earlier performances, which were not called *fabulae*, must have been without *diverbia*. He may have been helped to this decision by noticing that the *cantica* of plays were sometimes given separately.<sup>2</sup>

Whence then the term *satura*? If the preceding analysis is correct, it is not likely to be a descriptive term of Livy's day used to parallel a stage in the history of Greek comedy. For, to sum up the situation, the performance which is supposed to be parallel to the Greek Old Comedy is not polemical (Leo has made this point), is not even *risus ac solutus iocus*, but something more advanced, and is perhaps at times even serious. The only thing which suggests comedy at all is the designation *satura*, but any suspicion that *satura* means satire (and thus comedy) Livy carefully dispels by his etymology. If the context were such that a reference to satire was indubitable (as in Juvenal's *farrago libelli* and other later writers), then *impletas modis* could not affect our opinion of the meaning of *satura*. But under the circumstances, when there is nothing to indicate the satirical element except the very word *satura*—a word which in Livy's day had only recently come to be generally used of satire and which still inevitably suggested miscellany—it is impossible to ignore *impletas modis*, much more to assume that *satura* could be extended in meaning from satire to comedy. The term

<sup>1</sup> When Mommsen, *Rom. Hist.* (1908), II, 98, says that *grassatores* and *spatiatores* went around performing *saturae*, he is wrongly assuming that Livy intends to have the term *satura* apply to the *iocularia* (see above, p. 15, n. 3).

<sup>2</sup> From this custom the pantomime is supposed to have originated; Friedländer, *op. cit.*, 551.



must therefore have been used to suggest the miscellaneous character of the performance. Is it an ancient term, contemporary with the period of the performances, if they actually existed? There is hardly a possibility that it is. Here is the place to point out that undue importance has been given to the word *satura* as used by Livy because of our interest in the origin of Roman satire as a literary form. In his account it plays no more important a rôle than *fabula* or *ludus*, and Livy would be much amazed, could he but know what discussion his use of the word has caused. As the term occurs nowhere else in this sense, it is probably the descriptive term of the grammarian or annalist who was Livy's source. The miscellaneousness of these performances, if they ever existed, would be more noticeable after the introduction of the *fabula* with its organized plot than before; hence *satura* is meant to contrast with *fabula*. No one would argue from Livy's words that Livius Andronicus *must* himself have spoken of his plays as *fabulae*; the word *satura* should be treated in the same way. Even if it were true that *satura* was an ancient term, it would be entirely wrong—and this is the important point—to claim any relation between these *saturae* and those of Ennius and Lucilius—just as wrong as it would be to look for a relation between, let us say, a vaudeville "sketch" and a biographical "sketch."<sup>1</sup> Our conclusion is that we can not be certain whether the performances which Livy calls *saturae* were produced on the Roman stage, but that it is a comparatively unimportant matter whether they were or not.

<sup>1</sup> This, I think, is sufficient answer to Knapp's criticisms (*AJP*, XXXIII, 147) of Schanz's position. If Knapp merely insists that the elements of a drama existed at Rome before Andronicus introduced the Greek *fabulae*, then we are all agreed, for even Hendrickson, I am sure, is willing to grant this. But the fact remains that for scores of years almost every paper on Roman satire and almost every edition of Horace, of Persius, and of Juvenal has had something to say about Livy's *satura*. As a result Quintilian's "*satura tota nostra est*," and Horace's dictum (*Serm.* i. 10. 66) have been misunderstood. Writers on the Roman drama also have been led unconsciously to stress the particular stage described by Livy because it had the name *satura*. As a result of both of these errors, Livy has been misunderstood. It is the feeling that somehow or other this is wrong that rightly pervades the so-called skeptics. But in trying to correct this error they have fallen into the ancient one of confusing *satura* with *edrypos*. This is quite clear in the case of Jahn and Leo. If Livy had not used the word *satura* to the confusion of the moderns, and if the Latin word for satire had not been so like a Greek word to the confusion of ancients and moderns, all our troubles would have been avoided.



In view of the preceding analysis, it is hardly possible that there was any rigid adherence to Aristotelian theory in the formation of Livy's account. The author of our summary was no doubt familiar with current Greek theories of the rise of the Greek drama,<sup>1</sup> and got the very idea of putting together a story of the Roman drama from them. Very probably even the emphasis on certain details was unconsciously due to the same source. But that there was a conscious attempt to make the square facts of the Roman drama fit into the round holes of Greek theory is an assumption that seems unnecessary, and therefore unjustified, in the light of our examination of Livy's words. The observation that Livius Andronicus acted his own plays matches Aristotle's that the early playwrights acted their own tragedies (*Rhet.* 3. 1, 1403b. 23) and, not to mention others, Plutarch's that Thespis took the leading part in his own plays (*Solon* 29). The importance of the dancing in the earlier performances is indicated by Livy as by Aristotle.<sup>2</sup> The prominence given to the development of dance, song, and accompaniment reminds one of Aristotle's *ῥυθμός, μέλος, μέτρον* (*Poetics* 1447b. 25). The *satura*, as containing all of these and as a prototype of the *fabula*, certainly suggests the dithyramb. On the other hand, there are dissimilarities. For tragedy, Livy says nothing, for example, of changes like those introduced by Aeschylus (*Poetics* 1449a. 17). Tragedy and comedy are not carefully separated. Nothing is said of tragic or comic choruses—certainly a striking omission if we are to assume a conscious effort to parallel Aristotle's account. For comedy there is nothing corresponding to the *κῶμοι* (*Poetics* 1448a. 37).

Now that we have seen that Livy's account was intended to include both tragedy and comedy, Leo's suggestion (*Hermes*, 24, 77) that the term *satura* was suggested by Aristotle's *διὰ τὸ ἐκ σατυρικοῦ μεταβαλεῖν ὧς ἀπεσεμνύθη* (*Poetics* 1449a. 20) gains more weight. It seems to me not improbable, in fact rather likely, that a vague memory of these words of Aristotle's or similar ones unconsciously helped our nameless literary historian to the choice of the word

<sup>1</sup> So too, Knapp, in *PAPA*, XL, p. lv.

<sup>2</sup> E.g., *Poetics* 1449a. 22: τὸ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτον τετραμέτρῳ ἐχρῶντο διὰ τὸ σατυρικὴν καὶ ὀρχηστικωτέραν εἶναι τὴν ποιήσιν.

*satura*. This is of course an entirely different matter from assuming a conscious parallelism.

It remains to discuss such other evidence as has been adduced for a dramatic *satura*. We have disposed of Valerius Maximus as copying Livy.<sup>1</sup> Euanthius also speaks of *satura* in connection with the history of the drama, and Hendrickson believes that he substantiates Livy. But to my mind the explanation that Euanthius combined the remarks of Horace and Porphyrio on Roman satire with an account of Greek comedy is quite sufficient.<sup>2</sup> The classification of satire as the Middle Comedy is easily explained as an ignorant interpretation of Horace's "hinc [i.e., Aristophanes, etc.] pendet Lucilius" (*Serm.* i. 4. 6). If this is not satisfactory, it is still possible that Euanthius used Livy<sup>3</sup> or Valerius Maximus. No arguments have been presented against this possibility.

Horace gives an account of the rise of the drama somewhat similar to Livy's (*Epist.* ii. 1. 139 f.). Hendrickson sees in it a close parallel to Livy's review as he interprets it. That the description of the *Fescennina licentia* is like Livy's of the amateur *iocularia* is clear. But we can not go much farther. It certainly is most natural to take the words up to vs. 155 as descriptive of the Fescennines alone, and not of a further stage;<sup>4</sup> and surely Hendrickson's interpretation of 157 f., "sic horridus ille Defluxit numerus Saturnius et grave virus Munditiae pepulere," is forced. He takes "numerus Saturnius" and "grave virus" to refer to two different things—the Fescennine verses and the *saturae*. The two phrases must refer to one and the same thing, described from the standpoint of form and spirit. Thus Horace's account contains nothing corresponding to a *satura* in any sense of the term.

Professor Hendrickson has called my attention to the possibility of utilizing the passage of Dionysius (vii. 72), mentioned above, to

<sup>1</sup> Valerius volunteers a few additional bits of information that he happens to have.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Leo, *Hermes*, 39, 77. Lejay, *op. cit.*, xvi, n. 3, points out some of the similarities between Euanthius, and Horace and Porphyrio. There are a number of reminiscences of Aristotle (cf. especially the distortion of *Poetics* 1449a. 1—concerning Homer—in i. 5).

<sup>3</sup> So Lejay, *op. cit.*

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Lejay, *op. cit.*, xc.

confirm his position. Dionysius' avowed purpose is to prove that the Romans were of Greek origin, by showing that many of their customs were Greek. Naturally he is ready to stretch a point. In this passage he quotes Fabius Pictor, though he inserts some of his own observations. "The triumphal processions also make it evident," says Dionysius, "that ἡ κέκρομος καὶ σατυρικὴ παιδιὰ was ancient and native to the Romans." Then he goes on to describe the abusive songs sung during the triumphal processions. If we had only this passage, it would surely seem that Dionysius was using *σατυρικὴ* as a descriptive term meaning "satirical," and that the Latin *satura* had already been definitely identified with the Greek *σάτυρος*. This might necessitate a readjustment in our attitude toward Livy. But Dionysius' words must be studied in their context. They occur in the midst of the description of the *pompa* preceding the Circus games. Just before, he had said that, following troops of armed dancers, there came comic dancers (*σατυριστοί*) dancing the Greek *σίκυνις* dance, that some of these were dressed in sheepskins like Sileni, others in goatskins like Satyrs, and that they burlesqued the serious dancers.<sup>1</sup> Just after the passage concerning the triumphal processions, Dionysius goes on to say that he had seen bands of *σατυριστοί* dancing the *σίκυνις* at funerals. In conclusion he points out that ἡ *σατυρικὴ παιδιὰ καὶ ὄρχησις*<sup>2</sup> was a Greek invention, not found among any of the Italic tribes. We see then that under the term *σατυρικὴ παιδιὰ* Dionysius includes the comic dances taking place during the Circus *pompa*, the triumphal procession, and the funeral games. In connection with the first and third of these, he mentions the *σίκυνις*—a dance of Satyrs in the Greek satyr-drama, and therefore calls the actors *σατυριστοί*. The burlesquers in the Circus parade wore goatskins like Satyrs in the satyr-drama. This seems to be the starting-point of the whole story (it must have been in Dionysius' source,

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that Dionysius says that "the triumphal processions also make it evident." The "also" shows that Dionysius takes it for granted that readers will understand from the use of *σίκυνις*, *Σάτυροι*, and *σατυριστοί* that *σατυρικὴ παιδιὰ* refers to the antics of Satyrs.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Arist. *Poetics* 1449a. 22, διὰ τὸ σατυρικὴν καὶ ὀρχηστικωτέραν εἶναι τὴν ποίησιν.

Pictor). The wearing of goatskins by comic dancers called to mind the Satyrs of the satyr-drama and suggested that the Roman dance was really the *σκιννίς*. Then came the conclusion that all similar burlesque dances—whether the performers wore goatskins or not—were *σατυρική παιδία*.<sup>1</sup> There is then no hint that Dionysius even thought of the Roman *satura*<sup>2</sup>—and, after all, would it not be strange for Dionysius to account for the etymology of *satura* without saying a word about *satura* itself?

The Dionysian passage has an important suggestion for us with regard to Livy. It shows us what results from a conscious attempt to adapt Roman history to Greek. The performances of the *iuventus* as described by Livy might have been called *σάτυροι*, and *saturae* might have been thought of as the Latin equivalent.

Tibullus ii. 1. 53 ("satur . . . modulatus avena") has sometimes been quoted as an allusion to the *satura*, but this is impossible for the following reasons. First, the passage describes the origin of poetry and music (not of comedy). Secondly, the word *satur* had already been used in vs. 23, and its recurrence in vs. 53 is due to one of the most common characteristics of Tibullus' style—the constant repetition of words. Finally, in both of these places and in the one other passage in which Tibullus uses the word (ii. 2. 8) it alludes to holiday feasting.

We find the title *Satura* applied to a *palliata* by Naevius,<sup>3</sup> a *togata* by Atta, and an *Atellana* by Pomponius. This is probably a feminine singular adjective, meaning a "pregnant woman" (as in

<sup>1</sup> The *pompa*, as the name implies, was probably Greek, coming to Rome via Southern Etruria, along with the cult of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva (Jordan, *Topographie*, I, 1, 275). This Etruscan origin of the *pompa* confirms and in turn is confirmed by the supposition that the Fescennine verses came from Etruria, for these seem to have been used on just such occasions.

<sup>2</sup> *παιδία*, too, suggests the satyr-drama, to which the name *παῖονα τραγωδία* was applied. Liddell and Scott give no example of *σατυρικός* or any other word of the same stem used of Roman satire. Sophocles (*Gr. Lex. of the Rom. and Byz. Periods*) cites only the late writer, Johannes Lydus, who wrote specifically of Roman satire, for this use. The *σατυρικά κωμώδια* (*Athen.* 6, p. 261c) written by Sulla are best taken as *Atellanae* (Schanz, *op. cit.*, I, 2, p. 11). The glosses illustrate the usage of Dionysius (see above). It was pointed out long ago that the Greek word did not convey the same idea as the Latin (cf. König, *De sat. rom.* [1796], 24).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Schanz, *op. cit.*, I, 1 (3d ed.), 64.

Pl. *Amph.* 667), though in the case of Pomponius' *Atellana*, at least, there is no doubt a play on the word in its other sense, "stuffing."<sup>1</sup>

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Marx in Pauly-Wissowa, *op. cit.*, s. v. "Atellanae fabulae" (II, 1918): "besonders gefielen sich die A. Dichter in Zweideutigkeiten, oft obscönen, aber auch politischen Wortspielen." For the name of a food as a title, cf. Pomponius' *Placenta*. For other titles alluding to women we may compare: among *palliatae*, Caecilius' *Meretrix*, Turpilius' *Hetaera*, Naevius' *Paelax*; among *togatae*, Afranius' *Abducta*, *Suspecta*, *Virgo* (perhaps dealing with a pregnant woman, cf. fragment I), Atta's *Conciliatrix*, Titinius' *Gemina*, *Jurisperita*, etc.; among *Atellanae*, Pomponius' *Citharista*, *Dotata*, Novius' *Dotata*, *Hetaera*, and especially *Virgo praegnans*.

To prevent this paper from becoming still longer, the treatment has had to be somewhat technical, taking the work of preceding writers for granted, and not always referring to them specifically except for indebtedness on an important point. A number of things have been left unsaid, and I trust their absence will not lead to wrong inferences.

## THE FORMATION OF THE CHALCIDIC LEAGUE

By ALLEN B. WEST

Some years ago Swoboda<sup>1</sup> made the suggestion that the Chalcidian League was formed at the time of the revolt of Olynthos and Potidaea from Athens in 432. He based his hypotheses upon the narrative of Thucydides. The purpose of this paper is to present certain additional evidence, for the most part numismatic, and thereby to strengthen Swoboda's suggestions; I shall make use also of contemporary inscriptions. Before the Chalcidian coins can be used, however, they must be redated, and I shall devote considerable space to the discussion of this problem. It will be shown that the dates given by Head in his *Historia Numorum* are incorrect.

I need not touch upon the interesting question, recently raised by Harrison in an article in the *Classical Quarterly*,<sup>2</sup> as to who the Chalcidians were, whether they were colonists of Chalcis, as has been generally supposed, or whether they were a Greek tribe, in origin similar to the Bottiaeans. It will be sufficient to note that as early as the Persian Wars the Chalcidians seem to have acted as a unit in times of crisis. Herodotos<sup>3</sup> informs us that τὸ Χαλκιδικὸν γένος furnished a contingent to the army of Xerxes. Likewise the historian's account shows<sup>4</sup> that after the battle of Salamis, when Potidaea revolted from the king, the Chalcidians remained faithful to him and, as a reward for their loyalty, were presented with the city of Olynthos, which hitherto had been inhabited by Bottiaeans. Critoboulos of Torone was put in charge of this settlement. Comparing this with Thucydides<sup>5</sup> we may assume that Torone was a Chalcidic city. Thus in 479 Olynthos came into the hands of the Chalcidians and this fact

<sup>1</sup> Swoboda, *Arch.-epigr. Mitth.*, VII, 1-59.

<sup>2</sup> E. Harrison, "Chalkidike," *Classical Quarterly*, 1912, 93 ff., 165 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Hdt. vii. 185: περὶ δὲ τὸν Θρήικες παρέχοντο καὶ Παίονες καὶ Ἑορδοὶ καὶ Βοττιαῖοι καὶ τὸ Χαλκιδικὸν γένος κ. τ. λ.

<sup>4</sup> Hdt. viii. 127: τὴν δὲ πόλιν παραδίδωσι Κριτοβούλῳ Τοροναίῳ ἐπιτροπεύειν καὶ τῷ Χαλκιδικῷ γένει, καὶ οὕτω Ὀλυνθον Χαλκιδικῆς ἔσχον.

<sup>5</sup> Thuc. iv. 110: εὐθὺς στρατεύει ἐπὶ Τορώνῃ τὴν Χαλκιδικὴν κατεχομένην ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων.

found expression in the coins of the town which bear the inscription  
 A↓  
 LK upon the reverse.<sup>1</sup> Later coins of the same type replace this  
 inscription with another that shows that they were coined at Olynthos. These coins substantiate the account given by Herodotos and show that a feeling of kinship and unity existed among the Chalcidians of Thrace as early as the beginning of the fifth century.

The settlement of Olynthos by colonists taken from a number of related Chalcidian cities no doubt served to strengthen the union of these cities and to give to Olynthos special importance. It would be natural for the Chalcidians to regard it as a common possession in which all had a part. In time it became the center of Chalcidian interests, around which a closer and more permanent union grew up. This explains the importance of the city during the Peloponnesian War and the readiness with which the smaller Chalcidian towns upon the coast gave up their homes and migrated to it.<sup>2</sup>

Our knowledge of the history of the Chalcidic peninsula during the fifth century until the Peloponnesian War is almost entirely confined to what may be gleaned from the Attic Quota lists, which are in a very fragmentary condition and do not commence until 454. It is noteworthy that in some of the earlier lists cities which later became identified with the Chalcidian League are found combined. For example in 454, Olynthos, Scabla, and Assera are placed together; Mecycperna and Stolos also made a joint contribution.<sup>3</sup> In 445 mention is made of the Sermyleans and their *συντελεῖς*.<sup>4</sup> Athenian policy, however, seems to have been directed against such incipient unions and in the later lists each city is credited with its individual contribution. The union of Olynthos with Scabla and Assera is of peculiar interest, for it is the first indication we have of a

<sup>1</sup> *Numis. Chron.*, 1897, 276, pl. XIII, 6; Head, *Hist. Num.*,<sup>2</sup> 208. The coin in question might have been referred to Chalcis if the obverse type had not contained the figure of a horse cantering, the sign of the city of Olynthos.

<sup>2</sup> Thuc. i. 58: *καὶ Περδικκας πείθει Χαλκιδίας τὰς ἐπὶ θαλάσῃ πόλεις ἐκλιπόντας καὶ καταβαλόντας ἀνοικίσασθαι ἐς Ὀλυνθον μίαν τε πόλιν ταύτην ἰσχυρὰν ποιήσασθαι.*

<sup>3</sup> *I. G.*, I, 226. *Ὀλύνθ [ιοι] Σκα* *Μεκυπερ[να]ιοι*  
*βλαῖο[ι] Ἀσ[σε]* *Στόλαιοι* [ . . . ]  
*ρῖται* *Η . . . . .* †.

<sup>4</sup> *I. G.*, I, 235. [ἡ Σερμυλιᾶς καὶ] *συν*



union among the Chalcidic cities in which Olynthos was the central and moving figure. It was probably at the time when this union was dissolved that a change was made in the Olynthian coinage. The inscription  $\begin{smallmatrix} \text{OA} \\ \text{NA} \end{smallmatrix}$  took the place of  $\begin{smallmatrix} \text{AJ} \\ \text{LK} \end{smallmatrix}$  which had been used heretofore.

In the years immediately preceding the Peloponnesian War more than forty cities of the Chalcidic peninsula were tributary to Athens. The richer and more important of them were situated upon the two peninsulas of Pallene and Sithonia. In comparison with these, Olynthos and the other cities of the base of Chalcidice were small and unimportant towns. Acanthos, the chief Andrian colony, and Spartolos, a Bottiaean city, both surpassed Olynthos in resources and importance.<sup>1</sup>

We have now come to the point where Thucydides commences his history of the Peloponnesian War. It will be unnecessary to give a detailed account of the revolt of Potidaea except in so far as it was connected with Chalcidian troubles. The Attic Quota lists<sup>2</sup> indicate

<sup>1</sup> *I. G.*, I, 237, 239, 242, 243, 244, 259. If we take the lists for the years 443, 441, 437, 436, and 425 and compare the tribute of the various cities, we can come to a rough estimate of their relative importance. The following table, compiled from the lists of these years, shows how small Olynthos was when compared with its neighbors:

City	Year	Tribute in Talents	Year	Tribute
Ainea.....	438	3	.....	.....
Acanthos.....	443	3	425	3
Mende.....	437	8	425	8
Olynthos.....	438	2	.....	.....
Potidaea.....	436	15	.....	.....
Sermyle.....	437	4½	.....	.....
Spartolos.....	436	3½	.....	.....
Scione.....	438	15	425	9
Torone.....	441	6	425	12

The combined tribute from the peninsula of Pallene was about forty talents, that of Sithonia about fifteen, and that of Acte about five. The combined territory of the three peninsulas was approximately one-third of the area of the base of the larger peninsula, which paid about twenty talents. Thus we see that Pallene nearly equaled the combined wealth of the remainder of Chalcidice, and that Olynthos was quite small at this time with its meager two talents of tribute. I hope to take up the question of population in another paper.

<sup>2</sup> *I. G.*, I, 242, 243, 244. In the year 436, Stageira, Stolos, Scione, Sermyle, Mende, Torone, and Aphytis paid no tribute. The tribute of Potidaea was raised from six talents in 438 to fifteen talents in 436. The tribute of Spartolos was also raised during this period from two to three and one-twelfth talents. In 437 about fifteen cities are found in the tribute lists for the first time, which shows the activity of Athens in the Chalcidic region.

that there had been considerable discontent about the time of the foundation of Amphipolis by Athens in 437. This resulted in a raised tribute for many cities. The final instigation to revolt was given by Perdiccas, king of Macedon.<sup>1</sup> He had good grounds for opposing the Athenians and for trying to weaken their power, for they had been consistently but secretly opposing him, now giving assistance to his rivals, now encouraging his subjects to revolt. With these grievances in mind he entered into negotiations with the discontented cities of the Chalcidian peninsula and offered them his alliance and support if they would throw off the Athenian yoke.

When Athens heard of these negotiations she commenced to take measures against them, commanding Potidaea to raze a part of its wall, to give hostages, and to sever connections with its mother city, Corinth. Potidaea protested, then prepared for revolt after receiving promises of aid from Corinth and Sparta. In the spring of 432 Athens sent a fleet to Potidaea to enforce her commands, but the fleet arrived too late. Potidaea had already revolted and had made an alliance with Perdiccas.<sup>2</sup> The Chalcidians and the Bottiaeans also revolted and joined this alliance. Perdiccas then persuaded the inhabitants of the small Chalcidic coast towns to migrate to Olynthos, and, in addition, he gave them a part of the land of Mygdonia for cultivation as long as the war should last.<sup>3</sup>

Thucydides tells us that an alliance was formed, including Potidaea, the Chalcidians, and the Bottiaeans, but he fails to mention the formation of the Chalcidic *κοινόν*. His narrative, however, shows that so far as external affairs were concerned the Chalcidians acted together and formed a distinct body. It is to be noted that his account of the revolt is as follows. The Potidaeans revolted with the Chalcidians and the Bottiaeans and swore an alliance with them. He speaks of the Chalcidians as he would speak of the Boeotians, and he makes no reference here to the individual cities. It is evident, moreover, that he uses the term Chalcidian in a limited sense, for there were Chalcidian cities that did not revolt at this time.<sup>4</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> Thuc. i. 56 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Thuc. i. 57: *προσέφερε δὲ λόγους καὶ τοῖς ἐπὶ Θράκης Χαλκιδεῦσι καὶ Βοττιαίοις ξυναποστῆναι*; i. 58: *ἀφίστανται μετὰ Χαλκιδέων καὶ Βοττιαίων κοινῇ ξυνομόσαντες. καὶ Περδίκκας πείθει Χαλκιδέας κ. τ. λ.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Torone is a good example. See p. 24, n. 5.

natural inference is that a confederation of Chalcidic cities was formed then and that it is to this confederation that the term Chalcidian, as used by Thucydides in this and other passages, applies. We know that the official name of the league was approximately τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Χαλκιδέων.<sup>1</sup> Thus when Thucydides speaks of the Chalcidians, we must infer that he means the state and not the individual Chalcidian cities. If we consider the history of the war further, we shall see that the Chalcidians wage war as one people; that the army is almost without exception called Chalcidian;<sup>2</sup> that the Chalcidians by concerted action destroyed their sea-coast towns<sup>3</sup> and strengthened Olynthos; that alliances and truces were made in the name of the Chalcidians as a body, and not in the name of the individual cities;<sup>4</sup> that a Chalcidian proxenos was appointed for Thessaly;<sup>5</sup> and that Chalcidian ambassadors were frequently sent out.<sup>6</sup> There is a negative side to this evidence as well. The individual Chalcidian cities receive scant mention, so that it is evident that all foreign relations were in the hands of the league. We hear of no Olynthian treaties, and of no Olynthian ambassadors and proxenoi. The presumption is strong that the Chalcidians at the time of the revolt formed a close confederation, similar perhaps to that existing in Boeotia. I shall not attempt to give a more detailed consideration of Thucydides in this place, for it is my purpose to show that we are not dependent upon Thucydides alone for this period of Chalcidian history.

It is established, then, that an alliance was formed including Potidaea, the Chalcidians, and the Bottiaeans. That this alliance culminated in a close union is attested by certain contemporary coins. It has long been known that many of the cities of the Chalcidic peninsula altered their system of coinage at the time of their revolt from Athens. Until 432 the Attic standard was in common use in a great majority of the cities of this region, but this soon gave way to

<sup>1</sup> I. G., II, 17, 105. Dittenberger, *Sylloge*<sup>2</sup>, 77.

<sup>2</sup> Thuc. i. 62; ii. 79; iv. 7, 123, 124; v. 6-10. In the different passages the Chalcidians are distinguished from the contingents of the other allied cities such as Acanthos, e.g., *ibid.*, iv. 124: Χαλκιδέας καὶ Ἀκανθίους καὶ τῶν ἄλλων κατὰ δύναμιν ἐκάστων.

<sup>3</sup> Thuc. i. 58.

<sup>5</sup> Thuc. iv. 78.

<sup>4</sup> Thuc. i. 58; v. 30, 31, 80; vi. 7.

<sup>6</sup> Thuc. iv. 79, 83, 84; v. 38.

the Phoenician standard, then in use in Macedon. Macedonian influence had been a powerful factor in bringing about separation from Athens, and Macedonian trade was growing more important. Hence the change from the Attic standard to the one used by Macedon was a natural one for the Chalcidians to make as soon as possible after the revolt. According to the hitherto accepted classification of the Olynthian coin series,<sup>1</sup> neither the city Olynthos nor the Chalcidian League adopted the Phoenician standard until the first decade of the fourth century. This classification, however, is based upon the supposition that the Chalcidian League did not come into existence until after the Peloponnesian War. We should naturally expect Olynthos, however, to have been one of the first to adopt the new standard, and as the leader of the Chalcidians in their revolt against Athens it had need of money for carrying on the war. It is obvious that this was no time for a suspension of coinage.<sup>2</sup> Laying aside these probabilities, we have other reasons for asserting that the Chalcidians commenced their new coinage about the year 432. This new coinage, struck upon the so-called Phoenician standard, had for its obverse type the head of Apollo laureate, and for its reverse a cithara. There were at least three other states, the Bottiaeans, Arnae, and Acanthos, that adopted these same types.<sup>3</sup> Head says that these coins are contemporary with the early Chalcidian coins of the same type, but he places them all in the fourth century. It is clear that this uniformity of coinage could not have existed unless

<sup>1</sup> Head, *Hist. Num.*, 208 f.

<sup>2</sup> No other important city of the peninsula, except those actually destroyed or captured by Athens, suspended coinage during the war. In the years 424-423, or thereabouts, Acanthos, Torone, and Mende adopted the Phoenician standard. Amphipolis and Aphytis commenced their coinage about the same time, making use of the same standard. Potidaea, Torone, and Scione were the only cities to suspend coinage. This is explained by the fact that Potidaea was deprived of its inhabitants and made an Athenian colony early in the war; Torone was captured by Cleon in 422 and its defenders were taken prisoners to Athens; Scione was destroyed two years later; its inhabitants were put to the sword, and its territory was given over into the hands of the Plataeans. It is very probable, then, that as Olynthos and the Chalcidians set the example of revolt from Athens, so they were the first to adopt the Phoenician standard.

<sup>3</sup> *B. M. C.*, Maced. Acanthos, p. 36, nos. 40, 41.

Arnae, p. 62, no. 1.

Bottiaeans, p. 63, nos. 2, 3.

Chalcidians, p. 87, no. 5.

there had been a close political alliance between the states issuing the coins, such as we find for example about the same time between Rhodes, Ephesos, Iasos, Cnidos, and Byzantion.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, we can assign these coins only to a period in which Bottiaea, Acanthos, and the Chalcidians were on very intimate and friendly terms. This was not the case in the early years of the fourth century. We have a treaty<sup>2</sup> of about the year 390 between the Chalcidians and Amyntas, king of Macedon. From this we know that the Chalcidians were at war with Acanthos and the Bottiaeans. This hostility, as we learn from Xenophon,<sup>3</sup> was due to the comprehensive plans that the Chalcidians were making for the expansion of their league. Neither the Bottiaeans nor the Acanthians were willing to become members of this league. Acanthos was an Andrian colony, situated on the east coast of the Chalcidic peninsula, and may have attempted to exercise hegemony over the Andrian colonies or, perhaps, to unite them as the Bottiaeans and the Chalcidians had been united.<sup>4</sup> There is some slight evidence that these were her aims soon after her revolt to Brasidas in 424. In any case she could not suffer with patience Chalcidian possession of strategic points in her immediate neighborhood. Thus when the Chalcidians became masters<sup>5</sup> of Thyssos in 420 and Dion in 417, towns situated upon the peninsula of Acte, Acanthos began to feel jealousy of the growing power of the Chalcidian League. This jealousy became acute soon after the Peloponnesian War and continued until after the defeat of the Chalcidians by Sparta in 379. Thus it is impossible to conceive of any close alliance between Acanthos and the Chalcidians during this period.

As for the Bottiaeans, they enrolled themselves among the Athenian allies in 420, at the time of the peace between Athens and Sparta.<sup>6</sup> The Bottiaeans were close neighbors of the Chalcidians on the west. They had formed a loose confederation, as an inscription and coins testify,<sup>7</sup> and looked askance at the growth of the Chalcidian

<sup>1</sup> Hill, *Historical Greek Coins*, nos. 32 f.

<sup>2</sup> Dittenberger, *Sylloge*, 77.

<sup>3</sup> Xen. *Hell.* v. 2. 11 ff.

<sup>4</sup> The Bottiaeans had a common coinage and made a joint treaty with Athens in 420 (*I. G.*, I, 52, 53, Supp. p. 142).

<sup>5</sup> Thuc. v. 35, 82.

<sup>6</sup> See note 4, above.

<sup>7</sup> See above.

League. As in the case of Acanthos they were at war with the Chalcidians<sup>1</sup> about 390 but were conquered<sup>2</sup> very soon after. Thus we can date the beginning of the breach between the two states definitely in 420, when the Bottiaeans accepted the terms of the peace and became Athenian allies. The Chalcidians were at war with Athens for several years, at least, after this date.

Finally, the coins that indicate an alliance between the Chalcidians and the Bottiaeans must have been struck before the year 420 and after the revolt in 432. Having seen that these coins belong to the first decade of the war, we can have no hesitation in connecting them with the alliance which Thucydides says was concluded between these two states. The fact that they adopted common coin types is an indication that the alliance was very close indeed, and the further fact that the coins were struck upon the standard in use in Macedon points to the influence of Perdiccas and, consequently, to a date before about 410, when the Macedonians gave up the use of the Phoenician standard. It had been largely because of the efforts of Perdiccas that the revolt had taken place. The Bottiaean state and the Chalcidians were the first members of this monetary alliance. Acanthos must have joined soon after 424 when it revolted to Brasidas.<sup>3</sup> The fourth state to adopt this coinage was the little place of Arnae. Thucydides does not tell of its revolt, but he mentions it as a Chalcidic town<sup>4</sup> in the winter of 424-423.

This monetary league can not have continued for any length of time.<sup>5</sup> The coins that have come down to us are few and small in value, a silver tetrobol from Olynthos, silver obols from Acanthos and Arnae, and copper coins from the Bottiaeans. The league had been formed in direct opposition to Athenian power, and when once the purpose of the league had been gained, viz., freedom from the

<sup>1</sup> Dittenberger, *Sylloge*<sup>3</sup>, 77.

<sup>2</sup> Isaeos, v. 42; cf. Jebb, *Attic Orators*, II, 354.

<sup>3</sup> Thuc. iv. 84-88.

<sup>4</sup> Thuc. iv. 103.

<sup>5</sup> The gradual separation of Chalcidic and Bottiaean interests is shown by a copper coin of Bottiaea having the cithara upon the reverse, but for the obverse the head of Artemis instead of that of Apollo. The next step was the rejection of the cithara for the reverse type and the adoption of the figure of a bull. We have a bronze coin of Pausanias, king of Macedon, which seems to have been struck upon a coin of this type. This must date before 390 (Imhoof-Bl., *Monn. gr.*, p. 66, no. 6; *B. M. C.*, Maced., p. 63, nos. 1 and 4).

burdens imposed by Athens, and when the Bottiaeans became reconciled with the latter state, there was no bond strong enough to hold it together. Thus about 420 the union was dissolved. The Bottiaeans and Acanthians maintained their independence against the advance of the Chalcidian power, but Arnae probably succumbed and became incorporated in the Chalcidian state.

What bearing has the foregoing upon the origin of the Chalcidian League? In the first place we have shown that the Apollo series of Chalcidian coins was first issued about 432. It has generally been conceded that this series formed a league coinage. Although the mint was at Olynthos, the coins were not, properly speaking, the coins of that city. This is shown by the fact that all of the old Olynthian types were laid aside in favor of one that had a more general application.<sup>1</sup> The name of the city, moreover, gave way to that of the league. Upon the reverse of the new coins the inscription XAAKIDΕΩΝ occurred. Upon the obverse of one of these coins is the inscription ΟΑΥΝΘ[Ι].<sup>2</sup> This coin is to be placed at the beginning of the series before the city had become entirely identified with the league. The name of the city soon disappeared and was never replaced upon the coins. Therefore, since the Apollo series of Chalcidic coins had its beginning about 432, and since it was distinctly the coinage of the Chalcidians and not merely of the city of Olynthos, we must infer that there was a Chalcidian state at this early date. A consolidated currency is one of the surest signs of a close political union between states that have been hitherto autonomous, and the fact that at that time there was this distinct Chalcidic coinage proves conclusively that the feeling of unity among the Chalcidians had crystallized into actual union in the administration of internal affairs.

<sup>1</sup> Thuc. i. 118. The account given by Thucydides in this passage is worthy of consideration here. We are told that the Delphian god gave his sanction to the war and promised to side with the Spartans. Without doubt the Chalcidians were acquainted with this oracle. Their representatives had been in Corinth and in Sparta about that time. After the revolt had broken out and the Chalcidians had decided to adopt a new coinage, what more satisfactory coin type was to be found than the image of the god under whose protection they imagined themselves to be fighting? Amphipolis also adopted an Apollo coin type. It is at least possible, then, that there is some connection between the oracle given at Delphi and the adoption by the Chalcidians and their neighbors of the Apollo type for their new coinage.

<sup>2</sup> *B. M. C., Maced.*, 87, no. 5. Head, *Hist. Num.*,<sup>3</sup> 208.



Thus within the larger and less stable monetary union, we find a confederation of Chalcidic towns headed by Olynthos. We have seen traces of the beginnings of union during the days when the Athenian supremacy was at its height. Just as the colonies of Chalcis in the west acted together as a unit in times of crises so those upon the northern peninsula never lost that feeling of kinship which seems to have distinguished the Chalcidian colonies. In Chalcidice the Chalcidians had common interests, and all things seemed to favor the formation of a state out of the autonomous Chalcidian towns. Hostility to Athens gave them the first impulse and this was the bond that held them together during the war. Olynthos had been settled, not quite fifty years before, by joint action of the Chalcidians. Now at the suggestion of Perdiccas it was strengthened by the demolition of many of the smaller sea-coast towns, whose citizens removed to the inland city. Thus Olynthos became the natural rallying-point of the Chalcidians and the capital of the league.

The fact that the inhabitants of the smaller towns were so willing to remove to Olynthos, destroying their old homes and leaving all that to a Greek was so dear, the political autonomy of his *πόλις*, shows conclusively that the tie between the Chalcidians in the neighborhood of Olynthos was generally recognized, and was stronger than a mere feeling of relationship. That is to say, it culminated about this time in actual union.

It is impossible to state with certainty what towns were destroyed or how many of the Chalcidians joined the newly organized league. Such places in the immediate vicinity of Olynthos as Stolos, Mecyperna, Assera, and Singos were probably among its members.<sup>1</sup> As the revolt became more general, a larger portion of the Chalcidic peninsula was included in the territory governed by the new Chalcidian state.

We have the coins to show that there was a union among certain Chalcidian towns during the first years of the Peloponnesian War, and this is substantiated by the account that Thucydides gives of operations in Chalcidice. As I have said, a careful reading of Thucydides shows that, so far as external affairs were concerned, the Chalcidians acted together and formed a distinct body. The word

<sup>1</sup> See Swoboda's article, cited above.

ΧΑΛΚΙΔΕΩΝ upon the coins shows that this was the official name of the state. Thus when Thucydides uses the same term we must infer that it connoted for him the Chalcidian state and not the Chalcidian race. For example, Torone was a Chalcidic city, and yet Thucydides seems carefully to have distinguished the Toronaeans from the Chalcidians. In Thucydides, moreover, Chalcidice includes only that part of the peninsula which was in actual possession of the league. It did not include the territory of Chalcidian cities that remained faithful to Athens.

Thucydides makes it clear that the Chalcidians managed their affairs as one people. The coins prove that the administration of internal affairs had been consolidated. Thus we have only to combine the information given by these two sources and we see that the Chalcidic *κοινόν* was formed about the time of the revolt of the Chalcidians from Athens in 432.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE  
SWARTHMORE, PA.

## THE "CONTINUATION" OF THE *ODYSSEY*<sup>1</sup>

By A. SHEWAN

### B. IMITATION

A reaction against a view which has been almost universally accepted is in one respect like a brand-new theory that comes among men like a bolt from the blue—it must pass through three phases. First, it is jeered at; then comes a grudging admission that there may be something in it; and the last stage is, "of course, we always knew it." It is thus with the new attitude toward the question of the origin of the Homeric poems. In Germany especially, a stout protest has been made by a number of able scholars against the whole system of exegesis built up by Kirchhoff, Wilamowitz, Hennings, Robert, Fick, and a host of minor critics, and the protest has been effectual. *Communi sensu plane caruit* is the verdict on the Higher Criticism of Homer, and we are now at the point when the "unco wise" are wagging their heads and telling those who helped *rem restituere* that they are only flogging a dead horse, and trying to disprove things which they, the "unco wise," never believed.

It may be that this is so. It is equally true that many did believe, and do so still. To take one instance—it will not be denied that there were tracts in the epics which, in almost universal belief, had been proved to be late and inferior, and quite unfit to be fathered on the *Ur-Homer*, as that Protean creator happened to present himself to the mind of any one individual. And there are those still who, cherishing that belief, are confirmed in it by the reflection that formal refutation has in many cases never been forthcoming. The "Continuation" of the *Odyssey* is a case in point. We have had many demonstrations of its spuriousness—or rather an initial demonstration followed by rounds of applause from many later inquirers who added but little to the proof—and, till lately, hardly a serious attempt to defend it. The "unco wise" may have known all along that it was genuine and that the methods by which its condemnation

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *C.P.*, VIII, 284 ff.

was secured were contemptible; but, very unfortunately for Homer, they held their peace and failed to proclaim the faith that was in them.

Among the many means which used to be employed against the poems, the repetitions in the narrative had an honored place. The impulse to their use and abuse came from Hermann, who in his *De Iteratis* (1840) propounded the canon that repetitions are generally to be suspected, unless they are either the words of a messenger delivering his message, or merely formal lines belonging to the epic commonplace or *Gemeingut*. This dictum was accepted and acted on, even by Homerists of standing. It appears in the first edition of Leaf's *Iliad* (on O 263 ff.), and it is repeated with approval in Hennings' *Homers Odyssee* (1903, p. 36); and no weapon that has been forged by the destructive criticism of Homer has done greater service in the disruption of the epic structure.<sup>1</sup>

The working principle thus enunciated is fundamentally wrong, for it involves a mistaken allocation of the burden of proof, and inquiry is poisoned at its source. *Prima facie* every line in Homer is entitled to stand *donec probetur in contrarium*, and repeated matter as much as any other. The burden of proof is on him who condemns. For there is nothing strange or unnatural about the practice of repetition in any early literature.<sup>2</sup> Economy of phraseology by way of repetition is a feature "that marks early national epics" (Andrew Lang, *H. and A.*, 102 f.; cf. his remarks in *J. Phil.*, XXXII, 3). The modern man must be as original as possible; the early poet had no such feeling to hamper him. If a thing was good, and all in Homer is good, it might be repeated; *δὲς ἡ τρίς τὰ καλὰ*. And so

<sup>1</sup> It may be added that Hermann's exclusion of the commonplace has not been regarded. The formula and the phrase, aye, at times even the epithet, have been freely misused.

<sup>2</sup> I need not give examples; but I question if it is known how much repetition there is in authors of the classical periods of Greece and Rome. I refer to Wölffell, *Gleich- u. Anklänge bei Aesch.*; Fritzsche, *Die Wiederholungen bei Horaz*; Kellermann, *De Plauto sui imitatore*; for Vergil to Albrecht in *Hermes*, xvi, 393 ff., and for Ovid to *Mnemos.*, 1890, 164 ff. It is stated that Ovid's repetitions are more numerous than those of any other author except Homer. And more, the incongruities blamed in Homer are a common characteristic of Ovid's poetry. The poet takes some liberty in accommodating old matter to a new context. For Tennyson, a minute examination of the *Idylls* and *In Memoriam* has satisfied me that all the species of the Homeric repetitions are common.

repetitions abound in the two epics. They are more numerous than many readers of the text would believe. Schmidt (*Parallel-Lexikon*, pref.) calculates that the lines which recur, in whole or in part, amount to nearly one-third of the total, and that statement, as he shows, does not put the matter at its strongest. One can form an idea for oneself—it is a useful exercise—by comparing any one book, line by line and phrase by phrase, with the rest. A most careful analysis of this kind has been made for  $\Lambda$  by Ellendt (*Drei hom. Abh.*, 57 ff.), and it shows that there are few lines in that book of the *Iliad*, generally accepted as of the *Ur-poem*, for which, in whole or in part, exact equivalents or close parallels cannot be found.

For these reasons there is nothing to startle, much less to displease, the critic who approaches the poetry with an open mind, and with but one basic principle for poetry so situated as the Homeric, viz., Belzner's *der Dichter gibt uns die Regeln für sein Schaffen, nicht wir ihm*.<sup>1</sup> Repetition of matter is obviously a normal feature. There is nothing to raise an adverse presumption and so to shift the *onus probandi*. The disruptionist, on the other hand, eyed the repetitions askance, with something of the feeling of Herbert Spencer when he said of Macaulay's composition that it "resembled low organisms, being a repetition of similar parts." Hermann's initial suspicion jumped but too well with the inquirer's habitual attitude to the poetry—his conviction that the epics were the work of many hands in many ages. And he had only to add to this suspicion a soupçon of evidence—some small grammatical irregularity in the passage which he wished to eliminate, some discrepancy, some inferiority, or some other aberration, and the suspicion of the presence of the "sedulous ape" was made a certainty. Small wonder that the method became highly popular. It had the merit and attraction of simplicity; the veriest tyro could apply it, and did so in many treatises. Books were written on the Repetitions alone, all in German except one, Goldschmidt's *Gentagelserne i de homeriske Digte* (Copenhagen, 1900), a large and careful but not very illuminating compilation. I need name here only the outstanding works, Sittl's and Gemoll's (*Hermes*, xviii, 34 ff.) for the *Odyssey*, and Christ's

<sup>1</sup> Approved by Drerup, *Neue Wege u. Ziele der Homerforschung*, 26, and made cardinal in his recent work on E.

for the *Iliad*. But the output went on till Rothe, roused by the excesses that were being committed, published his *Bedeutung der Wiederholungen* in 1890. The effect was surprising. There has been no further separate publication of the kind. These efforts ceased on the moment, as cease the cries of a pack of Indian jackals when the angry sleeper steps outside his tent and discharges a barrel of his revolver. But the evil that men do lives after them. The *method* was too fruitful to be given up; and those familiar with the works of Robert, Fick, Wilamowitz, Hennings, and many others, well know what an amount of mischief has been caused.

This department of Homeric criticism—if criticism it can be called—degenerated in fact into a hunt for “peculiarity” on which to base an inference of plagiarism or imitation, and no peculiarity was too trivial to be overlooked. An aberration which clearly pointed to the bungling imitator—a rare variety, for imitators are generally careful—was seldom detected. When Thomson describes the sportive lambs “this way and that convolved, in friskful glee,” the critics recall Milton’s “writhed him to and fro convolved” of the Prince of Darkness—and laugh. Can anything of the sort be produced for Homer? Instead, the dependence is on small improprieties, chiefly in grammar—of all things wherewith to seek to pin down genius—and of a kind that in the cases of other authors are simply noted and left.<sup>1</sup> But it even became unnecessary to expose irregularity or something which the individual could pronounce repugnant to taste. A hysteria stage was reached in which the critic simply took the Concordance in hand, drew up a list of parallelisms or similarities, and then, in sublime disregard of Ellendt’s demonstration and the everlasting truth which it embodies, proclaimed the passage to be condemned a cento. Point was added to the proof by denouncing the author at every opportunity *quod omne molitur inepte*. This vituperation, it is well known, became a speciality of the Higher Criticism of Homer. Volkmann has

<sup>1</sup> Few have ever been more extreme to mark such peculiarities and to amend or excise than Nauck. Reference may be made to Ludwig’s *Polemik* (Ar., II). Nauck did the same with Sophocles. Students of Jebb’s edition know how, on every other page of that great work, its author’s knowledge of the language and his feeling for the *θῶρος* of the dramatist make short work of Nauck’s objections, and restore nearly every line that he had sought to expel.

collected specimens in his *Nachträge*, ii, 16. For abuse of the plagiarist in particular, one might refer to Wilamowitz' section on the "Continuation" (*H.U.*, 67 ff.). Parts of the *Odyssey* are characterized by *slavische Abhängigkeit*, *notorische Flickcharacter*, *dürftigen Flickereien*, *stümperhaft Unschicklichkeit*, etc. There is "a want of polish" in this. "Invective is not argument." Or again, the case was bolstered up by means of strange expedients. Hennings (*op. cit.*, 587) proves borrowing in the *Nekyia* by a list of parallel passages. "One-third of all the verses"—not more than Ellendt found in *A*—"are borrowed or formal." But certain parts do not display this infirmity in the same degree. So "these may have been borrowed from lost poems"! And the imitation has not always been well done; there are "discrepancies." That only shows "how desultory the work of the Rhapsode was"! Surely the most unkindest cut of all! If there is one thing which we are to believe in this matter, it is that the Rhapsode, the *Flickpoet*, the *λόγιος ἀνὴρ*, the *Bearbeiter*, *ἡ δαὲς δῆποτε χάρει δνομαζόμενος*, knew his Homer well and could patch you up a line, a passage, a cento, out of fragments culled from every part of the poems. He took pains with his mosaics. *Improbo labore splendor pannos undique corradi et consuit*, Naber says of him (*Q.H.*, 76).<sup>1</sup> And now to have a patron turn on him and reproach him with desultoriness! But what are we to say of such procedure? Just what Hennings himself, well capable of appreciating exuberant eccentricity in another, says of Fick's *Zahlenspiel*,—*das nenne ich nicht ein wissenschaftlichen Verfahren, sondern ein Lustexempel* (*W. kl. Phil.*, 1910, 490). Roemer asks (*Ein Dichter u. ein Kritiker*, 7) of just such another piece of criticism, "are we dealing with Homeric poets or with Byzantine Centonarii?"

Or the method may be estimated by results. The criteria employed are so weak that one can often retort by proving, *by the same method*, that the imitator is the imitated. Gemoll proved the *Doloneia* later than the *Odyssey* from the parallel passages, and Düntzer proved it earlier by exactly the same means. The *Doloneia* has also been shown in this way to be earlier than early parts of the *Iliad* (*Lay of Dolon*, 123 f.). Or the equations or inferences were sometimes stated in ignorance of the fact that some one

<sup>1</sup> In words unconsciously taken from Spohn, *De extrema Odysseae parte*, 91.



else had already used them the reverse way. That was inevitable. One critic says B 55 is taken from K 302; another, that K 302 is from B 55. Or take the case of K 242-44 and α 64-7; I know of 15 authorities who have studied the two passages, *all satisfied that there is plagiarism in the one or the other*. Of these 9 say the one is the imitator, and 6 that the other is. Or yet again, consider the lengths to which the process carried the enthusiasts who were satisfied a priori that the repetition meant imitation, and that all they had to do was to discover some flaw. Let me give two out of a number of extreme cases. Von Christ (*Wiederholungen*, 254) argues against Ψ 235 as compared with B 42, and this is how he depreciates it. "We too are in the habit, when we are wakened, of sitting up and pulling on our stockings; but when anyone wants to speak with us at such an early hour, we don't lie still in bed, but, unless illness prevents us, we go to meet him!" Sittl (p. 45) compares Σ 108 and ξ 464. "As singing at meals was a practice of the Greeks even in the heroic age, and so is not here considered to be a pernicious consequence of wine (?), I should be disposed to find in the latter passage a parechetic imitation of the former." I might add Wilamowitz' remarks, on B 42 and α 437 (*H.U.*, 8), on the impossibility of putting on a χιτὼν ποδῆρης while sitting on a bed, for which it may suffice to refer to Hennings' rebuke (*op. cit.*, 72).<sup>1</sup> It is surely not too much to say that men who can allow a prejudice to carry them so far had better refrain altogether from criticizing epic poetry. Well does Erhardt say (*Entstehung*, XCV) that this procedure has been "one of the worst weaknesses of Homeric criticism," and stigmatize it as a "downright nuisance."

And these operations prove too much. If the experts are correct, a state of things results which no sane critic could accept. The total effect is unthinkable. Even Mr. Lang's "a thing of shreds and patches" is then no adequate description of the epic. Can we conceive the *unus color* and the *mirificus concentus* that Wolf admired to be the outcome of such ἀνῆπιθμον manipulation? Is it likely that the epics were ever subjected to such treatment, exposed to the attentions of the fools of every age,—the meddlers are always *Stümpers* or "dolts"—and that, if they were, this continued mal-

<sup>1</sup> And now to Professor Babbitt in *Class. Jour.*, VIII, 214.

feasance should issue in the production of the two great epics of the world?

This means of proving (in Erhardt's words) "almost anything one likes about any part of the Homeric poetry" has helped to establish the lateness and spuriousness of the "Continuation." In Spohn's day the repetitions had not assumed importance in Homeric criticism, but he gives a list and quotes Pope's opinion about those in the *Nekyia*. But his successor, Liesegang (*De extrema Odysseae parte diss.*, 1855), makes free use of them, and few who have discussed the "Continuation" since have failed to refer to this blot on it. I could not deal with all the demonstrations of the kind, even if I had "a heart of bronze within me" and the space in a volume of *Classical Philology* at my disposal. I will give one sample of the extreme form of procedure, from Hennings' work.

The opening of the "Continuation," ψ 297 ff., contains a recapitulation (*ἀνακεφαλαίωσις*) of the adventures of Odysseus, 310-42. Before the reunited husband and wife sleep, the former tells of all the "most disastrous chances," the "moving accidents by flood and field" that had befallen him in his wanderings; and as in other *ἀνακεφαλαίωσεις* in the poems, the poet *more suo* uses phrases which he had used before, sometimes more than once. An example is the narration of Achilles to Thetis in A 365 ff. Knowing the epic way, we expect many pieces of description to recur in the *ipsissima verba* used earlier in the book. Much the same may be said of the *Chryseid*, A 430 ff. Besides the voyage to Chrysé and the return, and the sacrifice there, the episode contains a short speech by Odysseus, the restoration of Chryséis and a prayer by her father. The epic "runs" describing the sailing and the sacrifice are of course in the formal language which is used on other similar occasions in the poems; the incidents at Chrysé are as naturally told in terms which have been used earlier in the narrative. And no one who has regard to epic practice finds anything to excite unfavorable remark. To the repetition-expert, however, it is *crambe repetita* which betrays the late, unscrupulous *Flickpoet*.

So Hennings, with reference to the *ἀνακεφαλαίωσις* in ψ (*op. cit.*, 578 f.). The lines which are found in whole or in part in other places in the poems are all set out, and are deemed sufficient, with

a few other alleged defects—which will be dealt with in another paper—to prove that the passage was composed by a wretched *Kompiletor*. In ψ 314 it is the phrase *δ μιν πρόφρων ὑπέδεκτο*, which occurs in three other places. In 315 it is *φίλῃν ἐς πατρίδ' ἰκέσθαι*! In 316 it is *ἀναρπάξασα θύελλα πόντον ἐπ' ἰχθυόεντα φέρεν βαρέα στενάχοντα*, which is used in δ and ε. In 318 it is the words *Τηλεπύλον Λαιστρυγονίην*, in 322, *Ἄιδεω δόμον εὐρώεντα*! 323 = κ 492 and λ 165, *ψυχῇ χρησόμενος Θηβαίου Τειρεσίαο*. 325, *μητέρα θ' ἣ μιν ἔτικτε καὶ ἔτρεφε τυτθὸν ἔοντα*, is said to be taken, the first hemistich from X 428, and the second from α 435. But see also λ 67 and Θ 283, and cf. Α 223, N 466, and other passages. And so on. Where we have not recognized epic commonplace, we have old phrases used of similar, or rather, in an *ἀνακεφαλαίωσις*, of the same situations. And unless we are to deny absolutely to the poet the privilege of repetition which is established by the whole body of the poetry and illustrated on every page of it, there is no reason for suspicion.

If the repetitions are to be relied on for disproving the originality of a passage, every parallelism in it must be considered, and cogent grounds discovered for the inference of imitation or plagiarism. Sober procedure of this kind is a characteristic of the commentary in Monro's edition of ν-ω. Reasons are given in many cases, and coming from a scholar of his standing in the modern Homeric world are of course entitled to weight.

The passages discussed by him are:

ω 39 f. (Agamemnon to Achilles, in Hades): *σὺ δ' ἐν στροφάλιγγι κονίης κείσο μέγας μεγαλωστί, λελασμένος ἵπποσυνάων*, which is = Π 775-76, "where *λελ. ἵππ.* is said—more appropriately—of the chariot-driver (Sittl)." Professor Scott, in *Am. J. Phil.*, XXXII, 315 f., has refuted this notion. But I think the argument may take broader ground. Monro and Sittl could have reason only if it be held that the word *ἵπποσύνη* must *always* mean "driving" and nothing else—not, for instance, "knighthood" (Seymour), *Wagenkampf* (Autenrieth), "chivalry" (Butcher and Lang), or "chivalrous feats" (Hayman). The objection has no regard to the wondrous variety of the meanings of words in Homer. One might add to Professor Scott's references Α 503, of Hector, *ἵπποσύνη καὶ ἔγχει*

μέρμερα ῥέζων, and Ψ 289, of Eumelus—a chief, not a *ἡνίοχος*—*ἱπποσύνη ἐκέαστο*. In Ψ 307, *ἱπποσύναι* are glorified as a high accomplishment, which Zeus and Poseidon "teach" to men; and the noun has, as if in anticipation of Sittl, the adjective *παντοῖαι*. This case is surprising in its futility. Equally weak is ω 52: *Νέστωρ, οὗ καὶ πρόσθεν ἀρίστη φαίνεται βουλή*. The words recur, H 325 and I 94. "This formula is hardly appropriate here; Nestor has given no 'former counsel.'" The same argument is used by Wilamowitz in his essay on Θ, for which see *C.P.*, VI, 41. It is surely better, with Dr. Leaf on I 94, to interpret the adverb "of old, not with any particular reference," and the whole expression as meaning that Nestor was the *βουληφόρος ἀνὴρ* of the host *κατ' ἐξοχήν*. So Mure (*Hist. Gr. Lit.*, I, 330), quoting the formula.

ω 156-58: *τὸν δὲ συμβῶτης ἤγε κακὰ χροῖ εἴματ' ἔχοντα, πτωχῶ λευγαλέω ἐναλγικίον ἤδὲ γέροντι σκηπτόμενον· τὰ δὲ λυγρὰ περὶ χροῖ εἴματα ἔστο*. "*περὶ χροῖ εἴματα ἔστο* is a repetition, in un-Homeric style, of the latter half of l. 156." Lines 157 and 158 are taken bodily from ρ 203 f. and 338 f. Homer is not particular, in such a case of the fresh use of old matter, as to what precedes. The final expression, with *λυγρὰ*, stronger than the preceding *κακὰ*, gives point to 159, which goes on to explain that the Wooers little thought that in the ancient beggar they beheld the avenging Odysseus. A further objection, that "*λυγρὰ* is awkward after *λευγαλέω*," betrays a very noteworthy disregard of Homeric practice. Any number of instances could be given. Even for Sophocles Jebb has more than once remarked (*Oed. Col.* 554, 709; *Electra* 475) that the Greek ear was not so fastidious in this matter as the modern.

ω 165 f.: *σὺν μὲν Τηλεμάχῳ περικαλλέα τεύχε' αἴρας ἐς θάλαμον κατέθηκε καὶ ἐκλήϊσεν ὀχῆας*. The last two words "would naturally mean 'shut the door of the θαλ.'" But they may be due to imperfect recollection of τ 30, *κλήϊσαν δὲ θύρας μεγάρων*, words which refer to the closing of the door on the women servants." They may be; and they may not be.

And these, let us pause to observe, are the instances which support the charge of imitation in the *Nekyia*. The late poets who thrust their additions on the Homeric corpus are known by their unblushing plagiarism. They even went so far as to compile centos out of the

old and genuine Homeric lays as they found them. To Hennings and many others the author of this *Nekyia* was one of a *Menge von Homeriden und Rhapsoden*, and a mere *Kompilator*. Yet the above set of flimsy cases are all that Monro could discover to support such a theory.

ω 235-40: "This passage is evidently modeled on κ 151-4. Note (1) the conventional lines 235=κ 151 and 239=κ 153"—this is hardly worth noting; no inference is to be drawn from such lines—" (2) the constr. of μερμηρίζω with the inf. in place of the usual ἦ-ῆ and an opt."—which occurs also in Θ 167 f. and κ 151 f. and 438 ff.—"and (3) πρῶτον in l. 240 answering to πρῶτα in κ 154." The πρῶτον corresponds, we may equally say, to the πρῶτα in l. 238 of our passage. All this is trivial. The gravamen of the charge is in what follows, "in this place a second alternative is inserted, introduced by ῆ and the opt., thus giving the extremely harsh form μερμήριξε . . . . κύσσαι καὶ περιφύναι . . . . ῆ ἐξερέοιτο for 'debated whether he should kiss and embrace or should ask.'" The construction, or combination of two common constructions, is unique; that may be admitted. But as evidence of imitation it has no force whatever. The only evidence of imitation is in the πρῶτον, and that is not worth dwelling on. The rare construction rather points the other way. Why should a rare form of construction suggest an imitator? There are many such forms in the poems. Certainly the conclusion that the second alternative in 238 is an interpolation by some stupid meddler has at least as good warrant. Even if we cannot tolerate the single occurrence of the combined construction, we are not compelled to infer imitation.

ω 248: ἄλλο δέ τοι ἐρέω, σὺ δὲ μὴ χόλον ἐνθεο θυμῷ. "An adaptation—almost a parody—of the conventional ἄλλο δέ τοι ἐρέω, σὺ δ' ἐνὶ φρεσὶ βάλλεο σῆσιν." The point surely is whether our line is less suitable in its context than the other would have been. Let anyone take the Concordances and scrutinize the 13 occurrences of the formula with βάλλεο, and then say! The Continuator has chosen the better part, but he never gives satisfaction. If he copies the *ipsissima verba*, it is imitation; if he varies them, it is parody. In the present case readers who are not critics would say that Odysseus' object in using the expression was to apologize in advance for remarks

to the old man which in these days we should call "personal" when made by a stranger.

ω 368 ff.: "This transfiguration of Laertes is an awkward imitation of the similar changes wrought on Ulysses in the course of the story: cf. σ 70." The selection of σ 70 is most unfortunate. Any critic wishing to discredit the episode in σ (the fight between the disguised Odysseus and the beggar Iros) will have equally good ground for saying *it* is in imitation of previous transformations.

But what is "awkward" in our case? The poet, whoever he was, wanted Laertes in the fight which was about to take place, and, with the privilege *quidlibet audendi* which is used in other parts of the poems, invokes Athené's aid to make him young again. Is that preposterous in this single instance? Some commentators actually like the rejuvenation of the old hero and his Nestor-like reference to *tempus actum* in 376 ff. Hayman very appropriately quotes Lear's, "I have seen the day, with my good biting falchion, I would have made them skip." But to others Laertes in his new rôle is as objectionable as the figure of Nestor in the *Iliad*, foisted into it (in their view) by the obsequious Neleids of the Ionian settlements. Van Herwerden in *Mnemos.*, 1903, 32, "easily recognizes the imitator," from Laertes' words, *quae Nestoris in Iliade personam referunt*. Nothing could be simpler. The same critic says (in the same place) of—

ω 397 ff.: ὧς ἄρ' ἔφη, Δόλιος δ' ἰθὺς κίε χεῖρε πετάσσας ἀμφοτέρας, Ὀδυσσεὺς δὲ λαβὼν κύσε χεῖρ' ἐπὶ καρπῷ, "*ex ultimis verbis recte imitationem agnovit Hartman, coll. E 458*"; and Monro remarks that "χεῖρ' ἐπὶ καρπῷ is a phrase that is hardly in place here." It is quite in place if one joins it with λαβὼν, with Ameis-Hentze, and Pierron, who quotes very effectively σ 258, δεξιτέρην ἐπὶ καρπῷ ἑλὼν ἐμὲ χεῖρα προσήδα. Cf. also Ω 671 f. Hartman was too easily satisfied with E 458. But it really seems to matter little which verb we take the expression with. The taking of the hand and the kissing of it were performed very near, if not on, the same spot of it.

ω 410: δεικανῶντ' ἐπέεσσι καὶ ἐν χεῖρεσσι φύντο. "φύντο, used in imitation of the Homeric formula ἐν δ' ἄρα οἱ φῦ χειρὶ κτλ." (Monro). Mere assertion again. What is there in φύντο? The form is not objected to. And observe, ἐν δ' ἄρα οἱ φῦ χειρὶ κτλ.



being extremely common, we have in one case in the poems, κ 397, of a number of persons as here, *ἔφυν τ' ἐν χερσὶν ἑκάστος*. So our Continuator has a phrase ready to his hand. Had he used it, it would have been taken as proof positive of imitation. He uses a phrase of his own; it is still imitation. He gets no chance; the prejudice against him must be indulged. *Non amo te, Sabidi*.

ω 479 f.: Zeus to Athené, οὐ γὰρ δὴ τοῦτον μὲν ἐβούλευσας νόον αὐτή, ὡς ἥ τοι κείνους Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀποτίσεται ἐλθών; “=ε 23-24, where the sense is simpler: ‘you made the plan, and it is for you to carry it out.’” This is not much, but what could be simpler than our passage? “You yourself arranged that Odysseus should come and take vengeance on the Wooers. For the rest, do as you please. I think, now that your favorite is satisfied, you might very well arrange an amnesty and peace forever.” Cauer, *Grundfragen*<sup>2</sup>, 486 f., observes that both Kirchhoff and Wilamowitz consider the passage in ω the original.

ω 534: τῶν δ' ἄρα δεισάντων ἐκ χειρῶν ἔπτατο τεύχεα. “The line is taken from μ 203,” which ends with ἔπτατ' ἐρετμῶ. “It is open to the objection”—already dealt with in my former paper—“that the use of a form like τεύχεα as the final spondee is not Homeric. One MS avoids this,” with ἐκ τεύχεα ἔπτατο χειρῶν, “but the change which it makes in the order of the words seems the emendation of a scribe”—who must, very strangely, have had no objection to hiatus, or knew the rule about the Bucolic Diaeresis. But keep τεύχεα and admit it is objectionable. Must we then say there is imitation? This repetition-hunting is really very dangerous work. Anyone wishing to discredit μ 203 in turn has the materials ready to hand. τῶν is objectionable there, and the use of βόμβησεν in the next line of the noise of a splash in water is certainly (in the critics' phrase) “not Homeric.” So, without discussing that interesting passage further, may we not say that 203 “has crept in” from ω 534? It may be added that the essential words, ἐκ χειρῶν ἔπτατο, are not confined to these two passages. They recur in λ 207 f., and there are similar phrases with φεύγω in Θ 137, Λ 128, and Π 403, and with other verbs in other places.

The only serious case in the whole list is the next line, ω 535, πάντα δ' ἐπὶ χθονὶ πίπτε, θεᾶς δ' πα φωνησάσης. Imitation has been



frequently alleged since the days of Düntzer. In the words of Monro, "ὄπα must be construed as a cognate acc. with φωνησάσης. It is not so in the formal lines on which this one is modeled"—B 182, K 512, where the words are ὁ δὲ ξυνέθηκε θεᾶς ὄπα φωνησάσης, and T 380, ἀκουσε θεοῦ ὄπα φωνήσαντος. This states the point—the imitator was a bad grammarian and did not understand the constructions in the lines he was reproducing. But before discussing it I would beg reference to Mr. Agar's *Homericæ*, 152 f., where a good case is made out for reading ὅπῃ not only in all our passages, but also in many other places in the poems.

But if we do not consider that demonstration conclusive, we observe that there is only this against the line in ω, that in the three lines from the *Iliad* ὄπα is said to be governed by either ξυνέθηκε or ἀκουσε, whereas in ω it must be governed by φωνησάσης, which it cannot be. Now must ὄπα be so construed in the passages from the *Iliad*? Why may we not take ξυνέθηκε as governing θεᾶς and ἀκουσε as governing θεοῦ? Ebeling accepts this for ξυνήμι. We have, besides the middle in τοῦ ἀγορεύοντος ξύνετο, δ 76, τοῖν δὲ ξυνέχῃ, σ 34, and ἐμέθεν ξύνες ὦκα, several times. It might even be suggested that ὄπα does not go so well with this verb as words like ἔπος and μῦθος do. For ἀκούω, Κίρκης . . . ἀκουον ἀειδοῦσης ὅπῃ καλῇ, κ 221, is a good parallel. For further instances of the gen. of the person, see B 98, K 184, 276, M 273, O 506, Π 211, Ω 223 (ἀκουσα θεοῦ), ι 497, and other places in the *Odyssey*. In fact the construction of these two verbs with the gen. of the person is as common as with the acc. of the thing. But then, it is replied, that involves taking φωνησάσης as governing ὄπα in ω 535, and although, outside that line, the verb occurs 156 times, it never once has this cognate accus. This sounds formidable till we analyze the 156 occurrences and find that all are in the formulae (with variations), ὥς ἄρα φωνήσας-σεν (initial) and φώνησέν τε (final), except one. This does not give much scope for variety in the use of the verb! The evidence is quite inconclusive, and is no bar to our believing that φωνέω could take such an accus., as it did afterwards in Attic. Hayman thinks this "probable, though by no means certain," in our line. He quotes Ameis' comparison, for a verb with an accus. cognate in meaning though not in form, of λώβην ὑβρίζειν, υ 169 f.,

and ζῶειν βίον, ο 491. So Sophocles' γωμμένην ὀδύμματα (*Trach.* 50 f.). But this seems to be all that the commentators have to say for the possibility maintained above. In spite of their unanimity one may venture to doubt. And those who side with them have still to reckon with Mr. Agar's careful exposition.

The conclusion I suggest is that the evidence is altogether insufficient to establish the interposition of the blundering imitator in any of the passages examined; and that this part of the case against the "Continuation"—that it is the work of a late poetaster who could not write and to borrow or steal was not ashamed, is very far from being made out.

A third paper will deal with the *Nekyia*, ω 1—204. The unanimity in favor of the spuriousness of this part of the "Continuation" is greater than against any other part of the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*. None so bold as do it the smallest reverence, and a defence of it must be almost literally *contra mundum*. The strong element in the case against it, and one that has been insisted on ever since the days of Aristarchus, is the new mythological atmosphere in which we find ourselves. There are ideas and beliefs which we find nowhere else in the epics, and so are "post-Homeric." On examination these great difficulties have proved unreal.

ST. ANDREWS  
SCOTLAND

## REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT IN THE MACEDONIAN REPUBLICS

BY TENNEY FRANK

We are told<sup>1</sup> that the Romans after deposing Perseus, in 167 B.C., "liberated" the Macedonians, divided the territory into four republics, devised charters for the cities and a definite constitution for the states, laid down certain general regulations concerning revenues, armament, and coinage, and then withdrew. In general we know that the national constitution of the four states provided for an executive of each to be elected annually, that the power to elect these magistrates was vested in primary assemblies which gathered at the respective capitals, and that there was a senate to which very important, if not all, legislative functions were given.

The literary evidence bearing most directly upon the three departments of government can be briefly stated.

1. *The magistrates.*—Livy xlv. 29: "annuos creantes magistratus . . . ibi magistratus creari iussit;" Diod. xxxi. 8. 9: ἐν ταύταις ἀρχηγοὶ τέσσαρες [i.e., one for each state] κατεστάθησαν.

2. *The senate or synedrion.*—Polybius xxxi. 12. 12: δημοκρατικῆς καὶ συνεδριακῆς πολιτείας; Livy xlv. 18: "commune consilium<sup>2</sup> gentis esset ne improbum<sup>3</sup> vulgus . . . libertatem . . . ad licentiam traheret" (explained by the phrase "ut suum quaeque consilium<sup>4</sup> haberet"); Livy xlv. 32: (from Polybius) "senatores quos synedros vocant legendos esse quorum consilio res publica administraretur."

<sup>1</sup> See Livy xlv. 18, 29, 32; Diod. xxxi. 8. 9; Niese, *Griech. und Maked. Staaten*, III, 180 ff.; Colin, *Rome et la Grèce*, 438 ff.

<sup>2</sup> The MS reading is *concilium*, but the correctness of the regularly adopted reading is not doubted since the context demands it and Polybius' word *συνεδριακῆς* (xxx. 12) supports it. The MSS constantly confuse *concilium* and *consilium*: see *Theas. L. L.*, s.v. "concilium," col. 45, l. 14.

<sup>3</sup> The MSS read *esset improbum vulgi*. The end of the sentence proves that this emendation (of Sigonius) is substantially correct.

<sup>4</sup> The MS V reads *consilium* correctly, other MSS *concilium*. The context leaves no doubt that V is correct.

3. *The popular assembly.*—Livy xlv. 29: "*capita regionum ubi concilia<sup>1</sup> fierent.*"

The passages which refer to the executives and to the elective assembly are clear enough and need not detain us. Our interest centers in the synedrion or senate, for in its constitution and powers lies the peculiar character of this government. The evidence does not amount to proof but it points with a high degree of probability to the conclusion (a) that the senate was a representative body,<sup>2</sup> (b) that it was the real legislative body of the state, and (c) that its ordinances, being the ordinances of a territorial state, resembled in their binding force the laws of modern states. If this be true, the Macedonian state had a republican form of government which was not very different from that of more advanced republics of today.

Our first question is whether the new Macedonian senate can rightly be called a representative body. Of this there can be little doubt. Although the Greeks never, so far as we know, intrusted sovereign power to a representative body, the principle of representation was well known and widely practiced in certain religious and political bodies. In fact, the most obvious method of forming synedria in the numerous leagues and religious unions of Greece was to require each participating state to delegate some degree of power to one or more deputies who might speak for the state at large. This was surely the practice in the Amphictyonic league, the famous Delian league, and the league of the islands, whose representatives were empowered to pass certain ordinances which were intended to be binding upon the members of each league. It does not derogate from the principle as such that these unions had but little real power or significance. Many of the political leagues also delegated power of representation to deputies. We are still in doubt whether the

<sup>1</sup> The reading *concilia* is proved correct by the words that follow: *ibi magistratus creari iussit*.

<sup>2</sup> The proposal to give each Latin municipality a representation of two members in the senate at Rome (Livy xxiii. 22) was made during the Punic War. The constitution which the seceding Italians established at Corfinium in 90 B.C. seems also to have been representative with a unicameral legislature remarkably like that which Paullus created for the Macedonian republics. In this I follow Diodorus (xxxvii. 2) in preference to Strabo (v. 241), since Diodorus here seems to be following the careful historian Posidonius (see Schwartz, s.v. "Diodorus" in Pauly-Wissowa).

synod of the Achaean league was a primary assembly.<sup>1</sup> I am inclined to think that it was, in spite of the contention of Dubois, Lipsius, Beloch, and Swoboda, who believe it a representative body. However, the evidence is more clearly in favor of regarding the old Boeotian,<sup>2</sup> the Aetolian, and the Lycian synedria as representative bodies, and most authorities would be inclined to add to this list the senates of the Thessalian, Locrian, Acarnanian, and Magnesian leagues. Now, when Paullus shaped the governments of Macedonia he could hardly draw upon Roman ideas for the form of a national senate, since in Macedonia a number of cities had to be equally represented, and Rome had devised no method of government in Italy which did not contemplate the supremacy of the metropolis. Obviously the system of representation in vogue in many of the Greek leagues would better serve the needs of such a state. We may feel sure, furthermore, that if the synod of the Achaean league was actually a primary assembly consisting of such citizens as chose to attend, Paullus, and any other Roman, would have rejected that form in favor of one in which strict order and more clearly defined responsibility prevailed.

How the deputies of the Macedonian states were actually chosen we do not know, nor is this an essential point. The deputies who attended the meetings of the Amphictyonic league were not all appointed in the same way. For example, the *hieromnemes*<sup>3</sup> from Athens were assigned by lot while the *pylagorae* were elected by show of hands. The deputies from Aetolia were doubtless elected by acclamation in the general assembly, whereas those from the Macedonian monarchy must have been selected personally by the Macedonian king. And yet all of these deputies were representatives of their various states. The new historical fragment, usually attributed to Theopompus, makes it seem likely that the members of the

<sup>1</sup> Dubois, *Les ligues étolienne et achéenne*, 124; Lipsius, *Verhandl. d. sächs. Gesell. d. Wiss.* (1898); Beloch, *Griech. Gesch.*, III, 2, 183; Swoboda, *Klio* (1911), 458. However, I think Francotte, *Musée Belge* (1906), 5, is nearer the truth in considering the body a primary assembly.

<sup>2</sup> See Bonner, "The Boeotian Federal Constitution," *Class. Phil.* (1910), 405 ff., Swoboda, *Klio* (1910), 319 ff., and Sokoloff, *Klio*, VII, 67.

<sup>3</sup> See Demosthenes xviii. 144; Arist. *Clouds* 623, and Cauer, s.v. "Amphiktyones," Pauly-Wissowa, I, 1923. Trajan ordered the selection of a municipal boule by popular election (Dio Chrys. ii. 74, ed. von Arnim), but this was probably unusual.

Boeotian senate of the fourth century were drawn by lot from among the principal senates of the various cities.<sup>1</sup> Just what method Paullus prescribed for the new Macedonian republics we do not know. It does not seem probable that the members were chosen by lot; for that method little accords with Roman practice and was discouraged even at Athens when the Romans became influential there.<sup>2</sup> Neither is there any reason to think that Paullus would have introduced such un-Greek methods as selection by censors or by co-optation. If we may hazard a conjecture from a weighing of probabilities we should suggest as most likely that the municipal senates of each district were required to select a given number subject to certain qualifications regarding age, occupation, and wealth.

It is entirely likely, then, that the Macedonian senate was a representative body. A far more important question is whether this body was the real legislative department of the state; otherwise the new constitution would have differed little from that of a large number of already existing Greek leagues. In the ordinary league it was the primary assembly of the populace which had the power of deciding all important questions of war, peace, and membership. The synedron was usually a counseling body only, which shaped the ordinances and recommended them to the populace. But if one examines the three passages we have quoted above regarding the nature and purpose of the new Macedonian senate one discovers at once that this body was devised for a more important task than merely to give advice. The phrase of Polybius, *δημοκρατικῆς καὶ συνεδριακῆς*, is unfortunately rather noncommittal, but it tells something. When one remembers that Polybius calls the Achaean constitution out and out democratic,<sup>3</sup> his addition of *συνεδριακῆς* with reference to Macedonia becomes significant. Apparently the principle of popular government did not hold in Macedonia in the same way as in the Achaean league. Polybius' phrase implies that the new senate had real governmental powers, and the natural

<sup>1</sup> Swoboda, *Klio* (1910), 322.

<sup>2</sup> Köhler, *CIA*, II, 481; cf. Ferguson, *Klio*, IV, 1-17.

<sup>3</sup> Polybius ii. 38: *καθόλου δημοκρατίας ἀληθινῆς σύστημα*. Polyb. xxxi. 25. 2 leaves a strong presumption that Paullus made the Macedonian cities aristocratic. Damasippus killed the synedroi of his native city in Macedonia. That he was a democrat and had done the deed for political reasons may be inferred from the sequel.

interpretation of his phrase would lead to the supposition that while the populace (*δημοκρατικῆς*) was given the elective power, the legislative function was vested in the senate. The passages of Livy go farther. The first attributes to the senate at least the power to control legislation, and it apparently implies that the popular assembly had no right to meddle with serious questions (*ne improbum vulgus*, etc.). The second passage, "senatores . . . quorum consilio res publica administraretur," can only mean that the magistrates were to take their orders from the senate, for the verb *administrare* regularly refers to the functions of magistrates. If Livy is correct in this matter, then the senate is the governing power of the state. It is clear, therefore, that the Macedonian senate had powers that were not usually granted to the federal synedria of the Greek leagues.

There is, of course, one attested instance of a federal senate vested with strong legislative power, namely, that of the Boeotian league<sup>1</sup> of the fourth century. In that government the senate together with the eleven Boeotarchs had the complete and sole right of passing upon all important matters concerning the league. That Boeotian constitution exerted a wide and long-enduring influence in Greece. Athens borrowed important suggestions from it in 411 B.C. Wilhelm (*Sitz. Akad. Wien*, 1911, 165) has recently shown that Philip of Macedon used it as a model for his pan-hellenic union in 338, a union which several of his successors, notably Demetrios, Antigonos, and Philip V, attempted with varying success to renew. It is not at all improbable that the Romans came in contact with some of the ideas which had survived from this old constitution especially when in the years 170-68 they were spending much time in suppressing the democratic elements of the Boeotian league then in existence.

A glance at the nature of the charters which the Romans made for dependent states will prove that the foregoing interpretation of Paullus' constitution accords with a well-marked desire of the Romans to suppress democratic forms in Greece. It would not be fair to say that Roman administrators invariably urged the aristocratic forms of government upon dependents. Often they brought no pressure to bear whatsoever, leaving the natives their old insti-

<sup>1</sup> See Bonner, *loc. cit.*



tutions. Sometimes at the request of a city they even helped restore a democratic form.<sup>1</sup> One should also distinguish with care between the methods of different epochs. During the first half of the second century, for instance, when the Roman senate was so powerful that it practically governed the whole empire and the popular assemblies were in danger of losing all their powers to the senate and senatorial commissions, the foreign representatives of the senate naturally put oligarchic ideas into practice as far as possible. When, however, the democracy came back into power at Rome under the Gracchi, a period of *laissez faire* set in, during which there is little evidence that oligarchic ideas were being urged in the East. Sulla again reverted to the older senatorial methods, and even Pompey, though he had played democratic politics at home for personal reasons, betrayed his Sullan training while in the East by shaping the boules of Bithynia on the Roman-Italian model. Julius Caesar and the emperors, true to a new Roman tendency, turned their attention toward centering the power of initiative in the hands of the magistrates. With this word of caution against confusing the evidence of different epochs, we may consider some illustrations of the senate's earlier methods of revising the charters in dependent cities, keeping in mind all the while that new charters were never imposed upon subjects except where reorganization was requested, or was absolutely necessary because of the wreck of existing conditions.

In the first place, there was in the early period a marked effort to limit membership in the boules by requiring qualifications of wealth and rank, a principle which the Romans had long imposed upon the municipalities of Italy. The charter of Agrigentum<sup>2</sup> in Sicily had been written by a Scipio (probably Asiagenus, in 193) that of Heraclea by Rupilius in 131, that of Halaesa by a Claudius in 94. In all these cases qualifications of property, age, and occupation were introduced and the principle of election, which had been the custom<sup>3</sup> in Sicily, seems to have yielded to that of co-optation.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dittenberger, *Syll.*,<sup>1</sup> 266 (= *Inscr. Gr. Rom. Pert.*, IV, 433). Servilius Isauricus, a proconsul under Caesar, was thanked for giving back autonomy and *δημοκρατία* to Pergamum (46 B.C.).

<sup>2</sup> For Agrigentum, Cic. *Verr.* ii. 123; Heraclea, *ibid.*, ii. 125; Halaesa, *ibid.*, ii. 122.

<sup>3</sup> Ut leges eorum sunt, suffragiis (*Verr.* ii. 120).

<sup>4</sup> See Holm, *Gesch. Sic.*, III, 90; the boules of Sicily became important only after the Romans arrived.

Similar qualifications were introduced by Flaminius into the cities of Thessaly which were reorganized in 194. "A censu maxime et senatum et iudices legit, potentioioremque eam partem civitatum fecit cui salva et tranquilla omnia esse magis expediebat," says Livy (xxxiv. 51. 6). Mummius followed the same principle in making charters for the cities of the Peloponnese when he broke up the Achaean league<sup>1</sup> in 146. How early the peculiar Italian method was imposed of requiring a censor to make up the *album* from an ex-magisterial nobility we do not know. Pompey adopted this rule for Bithynia<sup>2</sup> in 64, but I am inclined to believe that few administrators before his day had applied the rule, since its introduction would have necessitated very drastic changes of government.

The practice of placing the complete responsibility of the government in the hands of the boule must have obtained much more widely than is now attested by authorities. It was of course the ambition of the Roman senate to keep the imperial administration out of the assemblies at home, and the senate had practically succeeded in placing the Italian cities in charge of the *ordo decurionum* of the municipalities. Such staunch senatorials as Scipio, Flaminius, and Paullus could have had little sympathy with the democratic régimes they found in Greece. Just how far they went in the oligarchizing tendencies in Greece we are not told, but we may judge from the results that they went much farther than the direct evidence at present reveals. The fact that Perseus adopted the policy of encouraging democracies when he saw that he must face a war with Rome is enough to prove that the whole of Greece firmly believed and feared that Rome's supremacy would involve a wholesale reorganization in favor of oligarchic government.

Fortunately we possess some inscriptional evidence on this point. A decree passed by the archons and synedrion of Argos without any reference to the demos was recently discovered at Argos (BCH [1909], 176). It is placed by its editor about 140 B.C. and seems to imply that some, at least, of the cities of the Peloponnese entirely dispensed with

<sup>1</sup> Pausanias vii. 16. 9: δημοκρατίας μὲν κατέστανε, καθίστατο δὲ ἀπὸ τμημάτων τὰς ἀρχάς. This is confirmed by the important inscription found at Dyme, Ditt. Syl<sup>2</sup>, 316.

<sup>2</sup> Pliny ad Traj. 79. On Roman interference in general see Chapot, *La province d'Asie*, 196; Swoboda, *Griechische Volksbeschlüsse*, 176 ff.; Liebenam, *Städteverwaltung*, 206 ff.

the popular assembly under the charters given by Mummius in 146. Similarly, an inscription of Andania in Messene, dating from 91 B.C., refers to several important decrees that were passed by the synedroi. The demos is mentioned only with reference to elections (*SIG<sup>2</sup>*, 653). These inscriptions show the direction of the Roman influence even in the cities, and it is clear that the objections to a popular assembly would be far greater in a territorial state where the difficulties of summoning a popular assembly would be more pressing than in a city.

Finally it will be remembered that a great part of the bitter quarrel which the Roman senate had with the Achaean league during the fifteen years prior to the fall of Macedonia was brought on by the democratic element of the Achaean league. Philopoemen and Lycortas, the strong men of that league during this period, constantly labored toward the democratization of the Peloponnese, much to the disgust of the Romans. When the former introduced the democratic policy of calling the league meetings in places accessible to the populace, Fulvius Nobilior, then in Greece, opposed the measure, though without results (*Livy xxxviii. 30*). The same strategos revoked the aristocratic constitution of Sparta and banished its supporters notwithstanding the urgent opposition of Flamininus. This led to an ugly quarrel of ten years which ended only when the senate compelled the league to rescind its action. Similarly, the senate interfered in behalf of the oligarchic element of Messene<sup>1</sup> and compelled the Achaean league to restore to that state its old constitution and position. Roman senatorial envoys like Flamininus, Claudius, Metellus, and Marcius were constantly learning how laborious a task it was to deal with a league whose sovereign congress was a popular assembly, difficult to summon, cumbersome in its methods of procedure, unsympathetic in its personnel, and they finally issued a general edict to the Greek states that the senate "desired all men to be like Callicrates," the pro-Roman leader of the oligarchic party in Achaia. After his experience with such a league, it is not likely that a consistent senatorial like Paullus would for a moment have thought of taking the Achaean league as a model for his Macedonian republic. At a time when Rome was doing its utmost to break up the Achaean, Aetolian, and Boeotian leagues because the

<sup>1</sup> Polyb. *xxii. 13*.

democratic assemblies in them were uncontrollable, it is inconceivable that she would consider the formation of a new state on lines that would promise the very same difficulties.

Bearing all this in mind, we must, I believe, give the most natural interpretation to the three passages quoted above relating to the functions of the Macedonian synedrion,<sup>1</sup> and decide that in all probability that body was the sovereign lawmaking body of the new republic and that the concilia were left only elective power.

We come now to the third point, namely, that the new republics were apparently not city-states, nor federations of city-states, but true territorial states. The leagues were of course federations of city-states approaching more or less closely to national unities, but, after all, not one of them, despite the efforts that it may have exerted, ever succeeded in merging its constituent units into a thoroughly welded central government. The citizens of the Achaean league were "Achaeans," to be sure, so far as coinage or war were concerned. But they never lost consciousness of the fact that they were also citizens of what had been separate, independent city-states, city-states which at any moment might again have to stand alone. Not so in Macedonia. The Macedonian<sup>2</sup> people, because of their common language, their supposed kinship, and their strong centralized government, had long shared in the benefits of a homogeneous territorial state. They had been classed according to cities by the Macedonian kings only for administrative purposes. As regards citizenship, they were always "Macedonians." It lay, then, in the nature of the case that when the new Macedonian republics were formed, they could and of necessity must be unified states with a strong central government, and that these states would be in no danger of disintegrating into separate city-states—a danger which was always imminent in the leagues. And it is in this respect that the new states were perhaps most unlike other ancient republics.

<sup>1</sup> The republics erected by Paullus were overthrown by Pseudo-Philippus so soon that there is little hope of recovering good epigraphical evidence regarding this constitution. But a late inscription, *CIG*, 1999, is somewhat unusual in indicating that the synedri of the Macedonian province still have the power of voting dedicatory inscriptions.

<sup>2</sup> Inscriptions may some day reveal an earlier *κοινὸν Μακεδονικόν* from which Paullus was able to get suggestions for his governments. See Ditt. *Syll.*<sup>2</sup> 262, and *BCH* (1911), 441, n. 3.

A word may be in place regarding the position of these new states inside the Roman sphere of influence; for it is usually held that Rome never intended them to be anything but mere tributaries. This view rests mainly upon the fact that they were required to pay Rome a certain annual tax. I do not feel convinced, however, that the inference is justifiable. The combined tax of the four states amounted to only \$100,000 per year, or about one-half of what before had been paid into the royal treasury. It may very well be that Rome did not consider this sum in the light of a tax and that it was not meant to be permanent. Rome as we know had been in the habit of exacting a war indemnity after every successful war by which to pay back the temporary tribute levied upon its own citizens for the costs of the war. Obviously, when the senate decided to remove Perseus and establish republics, no defeated government would be in existence from which to secure such an indemnity. It may be, therefore, that this annual tax was devised in order to reimburse the treasury and that it was considered in the light of interest upon a capitalization of the costs incurred in the war. And it is also conceivable that the Romans intended to remit the exaction as soon as affairs in Greece should go back to a normal condition. Both Carthage and Philip had been excused from a part of their indemnities. There is much in favor of the view that the Roman senate did not at this time desire entangling alliances of any sort in Greece. The obvious course of establishing a provincial government in Macedonia like that in Sicily, Spain, and Sardinia it refused to adopt. It allowed the new states their own coinage, which was always denied subject states. It specified conditions for the support of a native army upon the exposed frontiers, and it refused to take active possession, at least for several years, of the royal estates and mines it had acquired from the deposed Perseus. All this is explicable only on the supposition that the anti-imperialistic party was then supreme in the Roman senate. We know of course that Cato led that party and that he made a strong plea against expansion eastward. We know also that he argued not only on the ground that the diplomatic squabbles necessitated by a policy of interference were costly and useless but also on the ground that contact with Greece was demoralizing Rome. His peroration has been

preserved to us in the *vita Hadriani* (5): "We cannot rule the Macedonians; so we must set them free." It is probable, therefore, that the senate devised the constitutions of the Macedonian republics in all good faith as capable of serving permanent, independent states. They were not, as is often assumed, to serve merely as temporary makeshifts until Rome could with better grace lay hold upon the whole of Greece.

It will be apparent, of course, that the striking points in these constitutions could not all have arisen out of the imagination of one great lawmaker. Paullus like most Romans kept his feet on the solid ground of experience. Some of the good points in his scheme are due to accident. At most, perhaps, Paullus should have the credit of judging clearly and sanely what principles already in practice were applicable in the given circumstances. He dealt with a territory embracing many cities, and therefore the idea of governing by means of deputies which represented the several cities, a plan already in vogue in the leagues, presented itself to him as feasible. His natural prejudice, as a Roman senator, in favor of a strong senate rather than a general assembly, and the sad experiences of the senate in dealing with refractory assemblies in Greece suggested a centralization of the power in the hands of the few. Finally, the unity of the people for whom he was making the charter and the absence of separatistic ideas which existed in leagues composed of city-states presented a condition which was obviously too desirable to alter. Thus, partly by chance, partly through obvious object-lessons, partly because of Paullus' own genius, the first representative territorial republic—if our surmise is correct—came into existence.

BRYN MAWR

## STUDIES IN THE EXCLAMATORY INFINITIVE

BY ANDREW RUNNI ANDERSON

An examination of the text and notes of the standard editions of many of our Latin authors in the passages where the so-called exclamatory infinitive occurs has confirmed the present investigator in the opinion that the force of the construction is often misunderstood. Recent editions of early Latin poets show a somewhat better grasp of its significance, especially those of Terence, the author who uses it with the greatest relative frequency.

The first important study of the construction was made by Kraz more than half a century ago: *Die sogenannte unwillige Frage m. d. Acc. u. Inf.*, Strassburg, 1862. For its time it was a careful and scholarly piece of work, and when G. Müller investigated the same theme, *Ueber die sogenannten unwilligen Fragen*, Görlitz, 1875, he found little else than mere details to correct. Both of these scholars discussed Verg. *Aen.* i. 37: "Mene incepto desistere uictam. . . .!" (note the punctuation) and in my opinion both were correct in pointing out that the standard interpretation of the passage as though the Latin were some such expression as "Egone ut incepto desistam . . . .?" was wrong. It is with this Vergilian example that the student is generally introduced to the construction, and with its treatment as a question and its translation as "Shall I, vanquished, desist from my purpose?" (an interpretation which by mere accident happens to accord with Juno's action as subsequently related by the poet), a misinterpretation of the construction in general is lodged in the students' minds, from which few of them are ever disillusioned. Editors of Vergil have remained unaffected<sup>1</sup> by the interpretation of Kraz, although this as slightly modified by Müller was accepted by Draeger, *Hist. Synt.* II, 412.

None of these scholars, however, considered in any thorough-going way the origin of the construction or the real force of *-ne* which occurs in about half of its instances. The term *unwillig* is an incomplete description of the construction, since on occasions it can

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Forbiger's note.



express delight, and the term *Frage*, used as a concession to what was believed to be its origin, cannot fail to be somewhat misleading. Then came Warren's brilliant and epoch-making study of the enclitic *-ne* in early Latin (*A.J.P.*, II [1881], 50 f.) with his conclusion that in the exclamatory infinitive and in many other situations the *-ne* might be confirmative. As to whether the affirmative-confirmative *-ne* was of an origin distinct from that of the interrogative-negative-dubitative *-ne*, or whether under certain conditions the former was a remote development from the latter, I shall not at present hazard an opinion, since the decision is not vital to my present investigation. Accordingly, since neither Lindsay, *Syntax of Plautus*, p. 75, nor Bennett, *Syntax of Early Latin*, p. 423, has treated the question in a way that brings out its fundamental characteristics,<sup>1</sup> a full treatment of the construction in poetry from Naevius through Horace, supplemented by examples from prose writers of the same period when they shed additional light on the question, may not be without value. For illustration and comparison I shall cite also the principal instances of its occurrence in Greek.

The exclamatory infinitive expresses emotion; indeed, a better name for it would be the emotional infinitive. The emotion indicated is generally one of displeasure—pain, sorrow, regret, chagrin, pity, disgust, reproach, surprise, indignation, shame or the like (cf. Romain, *op. cit.*, p. 29)—rarely one of satisfaction or delight. Whether it expresses pain or pleasure must be made clear by the context. In point of development therefore the exclamatory infinitive will be found to be the specialized function of an infinitive clause that expresses the fact producing the emotion. The emotion may be indicated by a

<sup>1</sup> Romain in *R.Ph.*, XXXIX (1911), 28 f. was altogether too severe in limiting the instances of its occurrence to those passages in which the subject accusative was expressed and in which there occurs a negative or the enclitic *-ne* (which he speaks of definitely as interrogative, evidently not knowing of Warren's investigation), or where the infinitive clause is preceded by an interrogation. This very arbitrary principle of division forced him to disqualify about one-third of a possible total of thirty-two instances I have quoted from Plautus. His theory would disqualify two of the seven instances I have quoted from the Comic and Tragic Fragments, two of the four instances in Vergil, one of the five in Horace, about one-half of an approximate total of sixty in Cicero, and would allow the traditional misstatement to stand that there is only one instance in Livy. His theory suits Terence best, since there only about half a dozen out of a total of forty-three would thus be disqualified, but even here he finds some significant difficulties, e.g., *H.T.* 630, *Ch.*: "o Iuppiter, tantum esse in animo inscitiam!" where according to his own specifications he must consider *o Iuppiter* as the substitute for the preliminary interrogation!

verb—*dolet, pudet, piget, miseret, discrucior, queror, perii, gaudeo, gratiam refert*; or may be implied by an exclamatory phrase—*indignum facinus, flagitium ingens*, or the like; or by an interjection—*ah, uah, uae, heu, hui, ei, edepol*; by a general expression equivalent to any of these, or by the general tone of the context. In many instances where the context lacks a verb of emotion, scholiasts supply it for us, and these will be duly quoted. Sometimes an expression *di immortales* or the like calls the gods to witness the fact producing the emotion.

The emotional infinitive, therefore, expresses a fact or what for dramatic purposes is treated as a fact. The tenses ordinarily employed are the present and perfect, each tense having its full time value.<sup>1</sup> On the rarest occasions even the future may be used (Cic. *ad Att.* v. 20. 7: *at te Romae non fore!* xii. 49. 2: *o tempora, fore cum dubitet Curtius consulatum petere!* Livy iii. 67. 1), sometimes as part of a periphrasis, and the future is looked upon as an inevitable consequence of present facts. The infinitive clause may contain *-ne*, the force of which is seldom if ever interrogative, but confirmative. It having been established that the infinitive clause expresses the fact producing the emotion, the question as to whether the origin of the construction was interrogative or not becomes relatively unimportant. It is the personal opinion of the present investigator that the direct interrogative influence in the formation of this construction has been much overestimated by all the investigators from Kraz to Romain, and this was due largely to the notion that the *-ne* was of direct interrogative force.<sup>2</sup> But a history of the treatment of the passages containing the construction will probably be found to show the displacement of the sign of interrogation, and this has already been done for Terence.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The statement of Kraz, *op. cit.*, p. 36, deserves to be quoted: "Ich finde in dem Accus. m. Inf. des Ausrufs den Ausdruck des leidentlichen Affects, welcher durch Geschehenes oder Geschehendes durch Thatsachen oder Zustände erregt wird. Leidentlich nenne ich diesen Affect im Gegensatz zu dem reagirenden, der sich in der *ut*-frage ausspricht. Die Beschränkung auf Wirkliches (oder für wirklich Gehaltenes) ist der Erfahrung entnommen."

<sup>2</sup> Lane, 2116, holds that the *-ne* was transferred to the infinitive clause from the unexpressed verb. This view seems to me to go against the whole spirit of the construction. See, however, *Trin.* 1017.

<sup>3</sup> Editors as a rule are woefully inconsistent both with themselves and with one another in the punctuation used for this construction, as can easily be seen by referring to their texts in most of the passages cited below.

## ILLUSTRATIONS OF ORIGIN

## EXPRESSIONS OF DISPLEASURE

Ennius, 45 (Cassandra speaking):

mea mater, tui me *miseret*, mei *piget*;  
optumam progeniem Priamo peperisti extra me, hoc *dolet*.<sup>1</sup>  
mene obesse, illos prodesse; me obstare, illos obsequi!

Warren, *op. cit.*, p. 56, deletes stop after *dolet*.

Terence *H.T.* 749:

Ita me di amabunt ut nunc Menedemi uicem  
*miseret* me: tantum deuenisse ad eum mali,<sup>2</sup>  
illancine mulierem alere cum illa familia!

*And.* 868:

o Chremes,  
pietatem gnati! nonne te *miseret* mei?  
tantum laborem capere ob talem filium!

Plautus *Pseud.* 370:

CAL.                               ecquid te *pudet*?  
BAL.    tene amatorem esse inuentum inanem quasi cassam nucem!  
For a similar change of speaker see *Pseud.* 201.

*Trin.* 1017:

ST.       quid, homo nihili, non *pudet* te? tribusne te poteriis  
          memoriam esse oblitum!

Cf. *Bacch.* 481 f. and *Livy* iii. 67. 1.

Terence *Ad.* 610a:

AESCH. *discrucior*<sup>3</sup> animi:  
          hocine de inproviso mali mihi obici tantum. . . .!

<sup>1</sup> Unemotionalized forms may be seen: *Pac.* 44:

dolet pigetque magis magisque me conatum hoc nequiquam itiner.  
*Ter. Ad.* 272:  
          hoc mihi dolet, nos sero rescisse et rem paene in eum locum  
          redisse. . . .

<sup>2</sup> To my mind this infinitive clause is as clearly exclamatory as the following one with *-ne*.

<sup>3</sup> Unemotionalized forms may be seen in *Plaut. Bacch.* 435:

MN.   propter me haec nunc meo sodali dici *discrucior miser*.  
*Capt.* 600:                   Crucior lapidem non habere me. . . .

*Mil.* 617 f.:

PE.   quid id est quod cruciat? cedo.  
PL.   me tibi istuc aetatis homini facinora puerilia  
          obicere neque te decora neque tuis uirtutibus;  
          ea te expetere ex opibus summis mei honoris gratia  
          mihique amanti ire opitulatum atque ea te facere facinora  
          quae istaec aetas fugere facta magis quam sectari solet:  
          eam pudet me tibi in senecta obicere sollicitudinem.

Plaut. *Poen.* 842:

haec quom hic uideo fieri *crucior*: pretiis emptos maximis  
apud nos expeculiatos seruos fieri suis eris!

Terence *Eun.* 360:

*perii*, numquamne etiam me illam uidisse!

Cf. Plaut. *Bacch.* 627 f., 1090, 1102; Ter. *And.* 244, 688, all cited below.

*uix* *suffero*: . . . , *H.T.* 400.

*querebar*, Horace *Epode* xi. 11; *ah*, *Eun.* 208; *And.* 252 (cf. *Ad.* 329 and *Donatus*); *uah*, *And.* 688; *Ad.* 38; *ei*, *Epid.* 520; *uae*, *Capt.* 945; *hui*, *Cic. ad. Att.* v. 11. 1; *heu*,<sup>1</sup> Verg. *Aen.* v. 615; *Cic. Tusc.* ii. 9. 21. It is to be noted that Cicero here uses the construction in a translation from Soph. *Trach.* which does not contain the construction; *hem*, *Cic. ad Fam.* xiv. 2. 2; *ira incendor*, *Pseud.* 201; *dirumpor dolore*, *Cic. ad Att.* vii. 12. 3; *ergo*, *ad Fam.* viii. 17. 1; *quippe*, *ad Att.* v. 15. 1. For general expressions of emotion see *Capt.* 783; *Amph.* 882; *di boni*, *Eun.* 225; cf. *H.T.* 503, 630; *pro deum atque hominum fidem*, *Curc.* 694; *And.* 716 (after); *facinus indignum*, *Ad.* 447; *Phorm.* 613; cf. *Men.* 1004; *Rud.* 393; *Afran.* 52; *H.T.* 922; *flagitium ingens*, Horace *S.* ii. 4. 82; *sed*, *Eun.* 553; *at*, *Cic. ad Att.* v. 20. 7; cf. the use of ἀλλά and δέ in Greek; *malum quod isti di deaeque omnes duin!* *Phorm.* 976, cf. Arist. *Vesp.* 835, βάλλ' ἐς κόρακας.

#### EXPRESSIONS OF SATISFACTION

Ter. *Phorm.* 338:

immo enim nemo satis pro merito *gratiam* regi *refert*.  
tene asymbolum uenire unctum atque lautum e balineis,  
otiosum ab animo, quom ille et cura et sumptu absunitur!

Here line 338 and the *quom*-clause in 340 show clearly that the infinitive expresses satisfaction.

*Phormio* 883-84:

*PHORM.* . . . bene, ita me di ament, *factum*: gaudeo.<sup>2</sup>  
tantam fortunam de inprouiso esse his datam!

The fact (1) that this expresses pleasure, (2) that *-ne* is lacking, (3) that the illustrated MSS make no scene-division between 883 and 884 has caused many scholars (e.g., Romain, *op. cit.*, p. 32; see also Elmer's edition, notes

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Hec.* 282 f.:

*Capt.* 995: heu me infelicem, hancine ego uitam parsi perdere!  
eheu, quom ego plus minusque feci quam me aequom fuit!  
quod male feci *crucior*.

Cf. *Bacch.* 483 and note.

<sup>2</sup> For the unemotionalized form cf. Naev. 15:

*Afran.* 357: Laetus sum laudari me abs te, pater, a laudato uiro.  
uoluptatem capio maxumam *cruciari* te tua culpa.  
See Madvig, *L.G.*, 397.

and appendix to this passage) to disqualify it as an exclamatory infinitive. In reply it may be noted to (1) that in view of the origin of the construction there is no reason why it should not be used to express pleasure when the context makes it perfectly clear; cf. the Greek instances: Soph. *Phil.* 234-35; Arist. *Ran.* 741. (2) A study of the list of examples shows that *-ne* is unnecessary. (3) Except where the stage was left clear, the scene-divisions mark no break in the action. There was no pause in the action between 883 and 884, and so the question as to whether we make a scene-division between them or not has absolutely no bearing on the status of 884 as an exclamatory infinitive.

Cic. *Tusc.* i. 98 (Plato *Apol.* 41): *id multo iam beatius est. tene, cum ab iis qui se iudicum numero haberi volunt euaseris, ad eos uenire qui uere iudices appellentur . . . conuenireque eos qui iuste et cum fide uixerint!*

Note that both here and *Phorm.* 339 *tene* is generic and refers to the speaker.

Pliny *Epp.* iv. 3. 5 (Pliny is delighted): *hominemne Romanum tam Graece loqui!*

Plaut. *Asin.* 580:

*edepol senem Demaenetum lepidum fuisse nobis . . . !*

This instance may be regarded as an expansion of the exclamatory accusative (cf. Krüger, § 333, and Demosthenes xxi. 209) which often expresses pleasure.<sup>1</sup> The expressing of the verb here seems to have been made necessary to show its reference to the past. Here may be quoted another interesting example:

Tac. *Dial.* 6. 5: *Quod illud gaudium. . . . coire populum et circumfundi coram et accipere adfectum quemcumque orator induerit!*

At times we may see the reverse process to that stated above, that of the reduction of an exclamatory infinitive clause to the simple exclamatory accusative:

Ter. *Ad.* 757:

*o Iuppiter,  
hancin uitam, hoscin mores, hanc dementiam!*

Cf. Donatus: *ἐλλειπτικῶς* omnia utpote *stomachatus* secum loquens. deest enim *esse* aut quid tale.

304: *hocine saeculum!*

Donatus: *ἐν ᾗθελ* *questurus* de homini saeculum accusat prius.

379: *haecin flagitia!* not cited by Flickinger in his treatment of the accusative of exclamation in Pl. and Ter., *A.J.P.*, XXIX, 303, probably because of Tyrrell's punctuation.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Trin.* 591-92:

*di uostram fidem!  
edepol re gesta pessume gestam probe . . .*

Cic. *Verr.* v. 25. 62: Huncine hominem, hancine impudentiam, iudices, hanc audaciam! *Phil.* x. 3. 7: tantamne patientiam, di boni!

Some of the examples quoted above to illustrate the origin of the exclamatory infinitive were cited by Lindsay, *Syntax of Plautus*, p. 75, and by Bennett, *S.E.L.*, p. 423, and it is with pleasure that I acknowledge herewith my deep obligation to both scholars, even though in some minor matters I must dissent from their views.<sup>1</sup>

## PLAUTUS

- Amph.* 882: AL. durare nequeo in aedibus: ita me probri  
stupri dedecoris a uiro argutam meo!
- Asin.* 127: ARG. sicine hoc fit? foras aedibus me eici!  
226: (CL.) haecine te esse oblitum in ludo qui fuisti tam diu!  
580: See Illustrations of Origin.
- Aul.* 746: EUC. homo audacissime,  
cum istacin te oratione huc ad me adire  
ausum, inpudens!
- Bacch.* 152: (LY.) magistrum quemquam discipulum minitarier!  
283: NI. adeon me fuisse fungum ut qui illi crederem . . . .!  
481: (LY.) *dispuet:*  
quom manum sub uestimenta ad corpus tetulit  
Bacchidi,  
me praesente, neque pudere quicquam!

Interesting as showing a *cum*-clause co-ordinated with an exclamatory infinitive.

<sup>1</sup> Lindsay's quotation of *Bacch.* 237 and *Asin.* 407 as forms from which the exclamatory infinitive might reasonably be held to have been developed is not felicitous; also his suggestion that *Pers.* 42 may be a syncopated development of *Asin.* 127 is not well made. Furthermore, his classification of *Eun.* 755 as an exclamatory infinitive is founded on misconstruction, it being indirect discourse after *uides*, 754. (Thus we should be obliged to admit also such expressions as *Quantulum enim transisse militum*, Tac. *Agr.* 15.) Also his likening the force of the exclamatory infinitive to that of two subjunctive clauses (one of them a repudiative subjunctive) is positively misleading, and based on an error as old as Zumpt, art. 609, end.

Bennett, who quotes Lindsay with apparent approbation, adds certain examples of his own, suggesting among other things that *Hec.* 532:

(PH.) adeon peruciaci esse animo (te) . . . .!

may be a development of such forms as *Hec.* 547:

(MY.) adeon me esse peruciacem censes . . . .?

At first this suggestion seemed very attractive, but on further consideration it has not appealed to me as at all convincing.

The exclamatory infinitive must be sharply distinguished from the repudiative subjunctive and from all forms that are a substitute or a periphrasis for the latter. Accordingly, the exclamatory infinitive must not be regarded as an infinitive clause dependent on verbs like *patior*, *sino*, *spero*, *duco*, *iubeo*, and *oportet* understood, generally in the interrogative; cf. Plaut. *Asin.* 739; *Merc.* 785; *Poen.* 368; *Stich.* 132; *Truc.* 925; Terence *And.* 274-75; *Hec.* 613; Verg. *Aen.* ii. 657; v. 848; ix. 560; x. 668; xii. 643-44.

- 627a: MN. *perii.*  
 multa mala mi in pectori nunc acria atque acerba  
 eueniunt,  
 criminin me habuisse fidem!
- 1090: (NI.) *perii, pudet:* hocine me aetatis ludos bis factum esse  
 indigne!
- 1102: (NI.) *perii,* hoc seruom meum non nauci facere esse ausum!  
 Capt. HE. quanto in pectore hanc rem meo magis uoluto,  
 tanto mi aegritudo auctior est in animo:  
 783: ad illum modum sublitum os esse mi hodie!
- Capt. PHILOCR. *uae misero mihi,*  
 946: propter meum caput labores homini euenisse  
 optumo!
- Cas. 89: OL. non mihi licere meam rem me solum, ut uolo,  
 loqui atque cogitare sine ted arbitro!
- Curc. 200: (PA.) hocine fieri!  
 589: (TH.) sicin mihi esse os oblitum!  
 623: (TH.) seruom antestari!  
 694: CA. *pro deum atque hominum fidem!*  
 hocine pacto indemnatum atque intestatum me  
 abripi!
- Epid. 521: (PE.) ei! sic data esse uerba praesenti palam!
- Men. (MES.) *o facinus indignum et malum,* Epidamnii ciues erum  
 1005: meum hic in pacato oppido luci deripier in uia . . . !
- Mil. (PE.) meamne hic inuitam hospitam,  
 quae heri huc Athenas cum hospite aduenit meo,  
 490: tractatam et ludificatam, ingenuam et liberam!  
 626: (PL.) hancine aetatem exercere <mei> me amoris gratia!
- Pers. 42: TO. sicine hoc te mi facere!
- Poen. 842: See under "Illustrations of Origin."
- Pseud. 201: CAL. nimis sermone huius *ira incendor.*  
 Ps. huncine hic hominem pati  
 colere iuuentutem Atticam!  
 370: See under "Illustrations of Origin."
- Rud. 394: TR. *o facinus inpuicum,*  
 quam liberam esse oporteat seruire postulare!
- Stich. 765: STI. prostibilest tandem? stantem stanti sauium  
 dare amicum amicae!
- Trin. 1017: See under "Illustrations of Origin."
- 1046: ST. nonne hoc publice animum aduorti!
- Truc. 537: PH. hoccin mihi ob labores tantos tantillum dari!
- Truc. 933: STRAT. huncine hominem te amplexari tam horridum ac tam  
 squalidum!



## TERENCE

- Ad.* 38: *MI.* *uah*, quemquamne hominem in animo instituere aut  
parare quod sit carius quam ipse est sibi!  
237: *SA.* hocine illo dignumst? hocine incipere Aeschinum  
per oppressionem ut hanc mi eripere postulet!  
274: *AE.* ah, stultitias istaec, non pudor. tam ob paruolam  
rem paene e patria —! turpe dictu.

*ἀποσιώπησις εὐφημοῦ χάριν*, Donatus, who would supply *fugere* or *perire*; the perfect infinitive, however, would have been more exact. See Donatus on 274. 4 and 275. 1-3 (Wessner).

(304: See p. 65.)

329: *So.*

*ah*,  
me miseram! quid iam credas? aut quoi credas?  
nostrumne Aeschinum,  
nostram uitam omnium —!

Donatus 330. 3: *ἐλλειπτικῶς* omnia, quia fletus impedit uerba. deest autem 'hoc fecisse' uel tale quid. Cf. also on 329. 3 and 330. 1.

(379: See p. 65.)

390: *DE.* haecin fieri!

407: *SY.*

'Aeschine,  
haecin flagitia facere te, haec te admittere  
indigna genere nostro!'

447: *HE.*

*pro di immortales, facinus indignum*, Geta!  
quid narras? *GE.* sic est factum. *HE.* ex illan  
familia

tam inliberale facinus esse ortum!

563: (*SY.*)

non puduisse uerberare hominem senem!

610a: See "Illustrations of Origin."

629: *AES.*

haec adeo mea culpa fateor fieri. non me hanc rem  
patri,  
utut erat gesta, indicasse!

(757-58: Cf. p. 65.)

*And.* 244: (*PA.*)

quod si fit, *perco funditus*.  
adeon hominem esse inuenustum aut infelicem  
quemquam ut ego sum!

Donatus: condicionem humanam *dolet et queritur* natum esse quemquam, qui possit esse tam miser ut ipse est ac per hoc: se.

252: (*PA.*)

*ah*, tantamne rem tam negligenter agere!

425: *BY.*

nullane in re esse quoquam homini fidem!

609: *PA.*

seruon fortunas meas me commisisse futtili!

688: *PA.*

*uah, perii*: hoc malum integrascit.  
sicine me atque illam opera tua nunc miseros solli-  
citari!

716: MY. nilne esse proprium quoquam! di uostram fidem!

Donatus: -ne aduerbium percontantis est. This is one of those rare instances in which D. seems wrong.

868 f.: See under "Illustrations of Origin."

877: (SI.) num facti piget?

uide, num eius color pudoris signum usquam indicat?  
adeo inpotenti esse animo ut. . . . !

Eun. 208 f.: PA. ah, rogare quasi difficile sit!

Donatus 4: . . . subauditur 'te mirum est.' Cf. Donatus on 208. 1-3.

225: PA. di boni, quid hoc malist? adeon homines inmutarier  
ex amore ut. . . . !

360: See "Illustrations of Origin."

553: CH. sed neminemne curiosum interuenire nunc mihi  
qui me sequatur. . . . !

644: (PY.) hocine tam audax facinus facere esse ausum!

H.T. 401: CL. Syre, uix suffero:

hocine me miserum non licere meo modo ingenum  
frui!

Eugraphius, in his paraphrase, supplies 'uehementer ingemisco' on which he makes this infinitive clause dependent.

503: (ME.) di uostram fidem,  
ita comparatam esse hominum naturam omnium  
. . . . !

Eugraphius first supplies 'satis miror'; then (reading *ilane*) proceeds to render it interrogatively.

630: CH. o Iuppiter, tantam esse in animo inscitiam!

749 ff.: See "Illustrations of Origin."

921: ME. tene istuc loqui!

The next two lines might have been expressed as an exclamatory infinitive:

nonne id flagitium est, te aliis consilium dare,  
foris sapere, tibi non posse te auxiliarier?

H.T. 980: CL. adeon rem rediisse ut. . . . !

1041: CH. non mihi per fallacias adducere ante oculos . . . . !

Supply not the tame *scortum puduit* suggested by the editors, but the more expressive *scortum puduisse*.

Hec. 227: (LA.) non te pro his curasse rebus. . . . !

532: (PH.) adeon peruicaci esse animo. . . . !

Cf. Hec. 547 and H.T. 912.

645: (LA.) nosne hoc celatos tam diu!

- Phorm.* 153: AN. adeon rem redisse ut. . . . !  
 232: (DE.) nec meum imperium, ac mitto imperium, non simultatem meam  
 reuereri saltem! non pudere!

Cf. Donatus, esp. 233, 1. non pudere: hoc absolutum est et nulli adnexum.

338-40: See under "Illustrations of Origin."

- 465: AN. enimuero, Antipho, multimodis cum istoc animo *es uituperandus*:  
 itane te hinc abisse et uitam tuam tutandam aliis dedisse!

497: PHAED. adeon ingenio esse duro te atque inexorabili. . . . !

499: DO. adeon te esse incogitantem atque inpudentem. . . . !

- 502: PHAED. neque Antipho alia quom occupatus esset sollicitudine  
 tum hoc esse mi obiectum malum!

The paraphrase of Donatus is: neque tum *esset* mihi hoc obiectum malum, cum Antipho alia sollicitudine esset occupatus, leui quapiam, non hac de nuptiis quae est grauissima. See also his notes 1-3. Cf. Eugraphius: *uehementer ingemisco* me hoc tempore cogi agitare; quo Antipho in alia sollicitudine occupatus mihi auxilium non potest ferre. The inconsistency of the scholiasts and the widely different interpretations given by the editors make this a doubtful passage, so that there may be something in Romain's suggestion (*op. cit.*, pp. 30-1) that postulates a lacuna before 502. Otherwise the interpretation of Elmer is least open to objection. "To think that this evil was not thrown in my way . . ." = "O that this evil had been thrown in my way at a time when A. was taken up with a different sort of a care!"

*Phorm.* 528: AN. sic hunc decipi! (MSS decipis), dependent in a general way on Antipho's utterance in 525:

- non *pudet* uanitatis?  
 613: (GE.) *facinus indignum*, Chremes,  
 sic circumiri!  
 810: CH. itan paruam mihi fidem esse apud te!  
 883-84: See under "Illustrations of Origin."  
 976: DE. *malum, quod isti di deaque omnes duint!*  
 tantane adfectum quemquam esse hominem audacia!  
 non hoc publicitus scelus hinc asportarier  
 in solas terras! Cf. *Trin.* 1047.

Gulielmus was wrong in rejecting that very helpful verse, 976. Cf. *Arist. Vesp.* 835.

1042: (NA.) nil pudere!

NOTE.—The following passages claimed by some scholars as exclamatory infinitives I have rejected: Ter. *Eun.* 755<sup>1</sup> (Lindsay); 391 (Price on Cic. *de Am.* 98); Phorm. 709–10 (Fleckeisen); Ad. 934 (Vallquist); Plaut. *Bacch.* 66 (Bennett) where a careful consideration of the text shows that a repudiative subjunctive *penetrem* is required; Merc. 785 (Bennett).

## COMIC AND TRAGIC FRAGMENTS

- Naev. 72: quae ego in theatro hic meis probaui plausibus  
ea non audere quemquam regem rumpere . . . !
- Enn. 45 f.: quoted under "Illustrations of Origin."
- Caec. 292: tantum bellum suscitare conari aduersarios  
contra bellosum genus!
- 16: nihilne, nihil tibi esse quod edim!
- Pac. 40: . . . men seruasse ut essent qui me perderent!
- Cf. the Greek translation given by Appian, *Bell. Civ.* II. 146:  
*ἐμὲ δὲ καὶ τοῦσδε περισῶσαι τοὺς κτενούντράς με;*
- Afran. 52: o dignum facinus, adulescentes optumas  
bene conuenientes, bene concordēs cum uiris  
repente uiduas factas spurcitia patris!

Unless *dignum* be ironical, *indignum* should be read.

Trag. Inc. 204: hoc metuere, alterum in metu non ponere!

## LUCRETIVS

- ii. 14: o miseras hominum mentes, o pectora caeca!
- 16: . . . . . nonne uidere  
nil aliud sibi naturam latrare. . . . !

Reichenhardt, *Der Infinitiv bei Lucretius*, *Acta Sem. Erl.*, IV, p. 458, may be cited to show how sadly astray many of the special investigators of the infinitive have gone in the treatment of this construction. Quoted by Donatus on Ter. Phorm. 232.

## VERGIL

- Aen. i. 37. Iuno aeternum seruans sub pectore uolnus  
haec secum: 'Mene incepto desistere uictam  
nec posse Italia Teucrorum auertere regem! . . . '

The statement of Servius, 'ne non uacat, significat enim ergo,' while not conclusive, is nevertheless significant (cf. Warren, *op. cit.*, p. 64) against reading this as a question. Donatus (who in his *Interpretationes* comments on this passage with much the same spirit as that with which the Terentian Donatus deals with similar constructions in Terence) says among other

<sup>1</sup> So also Barth, *de Inf. ap. Saeculos Poetas Lat. Ueu.*, Berlin, 1882, pp. 9–12.

things: 'Exclusa igitur ab inuentione nocendi, exclusa loco et tempore sic animi sui dolores et gemitus intimis sensibus enumerabat . . . . *dolet ergo intentionem suam sine effectu defecisse nec superesse iam nocendi consilium uel tempus*. Interea bonorum est incepta deserere, si tamen aut prece flectantur aut sponte ignoscant. Haec *dolet* utramque se occasionem perdidisse et incidisse quod doleret cum ludibrio scilicet, ut superata discedat.'

o Danaum fortissime gentis

- i. 97: Tydide, mene Iliacis occumbere campis  
non potuisse tuaque animam hanc effundere dextra . . . .!  
cunctaeque profundum
- v. 615: pontum aspectabant flentes: 'Heu, tot uada fessis  
et tantum superesse maris!' uox omnibus una.

Servius notes that many do not make *heu* a part of the quotation, a view which it is hardly necessary for the student of this construction to point out as wrong.

- xi. 269: inuidisse deos, patriis ut redditus aris  
uiderem!

Quoted by Donatus on *Phorm.* 466, but missed by Maixner, *de Infinitivi Usu Vergiliano*.

#### HORACE

- Ep.* 8. 1: Rogare longo putidam te saeculo  
uires quid eneruet meas. . . .!
- Pph. in his paraphrase supplies 'mirum est.'
- Ep.* 11.11: contrane lucrum nil ualere candidum  
pauperis ingenium! querebar adplorans tibi.
- [Acro]: contra meretriciam cupiditatem quae lucrum captans rivalem praeferebat Horatio, queritur ingenium poetae optimi nihil ualere.

If [Acro] understood the passage, his scholium must be emended as above, so as to put a comma after *Horatio*, rather than before it. Another suggestion would be to alter *Horatio* to *Horatius*.

- S.* i. 9. 72: Huncine solem  
tam nigrum surrexe mihi!
- S.* ii. 4. 83: Neglectis, *flagitium ingens*:  
ten lapides uarios lutulenta radere palma  
et Tyrias dare circum inluta toralia uestis, . . . .!
- [Acro]: *magis reprehendendus es si torale habueris sordidum et non bene detersum pauimentum, quam si defuerint tibi pisces et uina optima.*
- ii. 8. 67: tene ut ego accipiar laute, torquiere omni  
sollicitudine districtum ne. . . .!

Indebetou, *de Usu Infinitivi Horatiano*, got all the instances.

Senger, *Ueber den Inf. bei Catull, Tibull, Propert, and Trillhaas, Der Inf. bei Ovid*, cite no instances of the construction in their respective authors.

## CICERO

Cicero as a user of the construction ranks with Plautus and Terence; indeed, with a total of about sixty passages, exclusive of his Latin quotations, he leads even Terence in the actual number of examples, although his use of it is relatively less frequent. A study of his examples shows him to have used the construction in practically all its varieties of form from those that are most pronounced to those that lie on the borderland between exclamation and statement. He uses *-ne* in less than one-third the possible total, though it is not at all improbable that in some of the remaining instances it may have been lost from all our MS sources, even as part of them have lost it in *Att.* vii. 12. 3. A very favorite form with him is that in which he introduces the construction with a separate exclamatory accusative, which the following infinitive clause defines, e.g., *ad Brut.* i. 17. 4: *O magnam stultitiam timoris, id ipsum quod uerearis ita cauere ut, cum uitare fortasse potueris, ultro arcessas et attrahas!* In my list these have been marked \*. This type seems not to have come into vogue until the time of Cicero. It was used also by Matius, *Fam.* xi. 28. 3, and by Lucretius ii. 14 f., but the earliest occurrences of it are found in the Verrines. With this type should be compared the earlier Latin usage of introducing the construction with an exclamatory neuter, *indignum facinus* or the like, and the Greek usage of introducing the construction with an exclamatory genitive:<sup>1</sup>

With *-ne*:

*Att.* v. 11. 1; vii. 12. 3; ix. 6. 4; ix. 13. 8; xi. 23. 3. *Verr.* v. 14\*; v. 62\* *-ne* in acc. excl.; v. 99; v. 123; *Rosc. Am.* 95; *Rosc. Com.* 4. *Cluent.* 15;\* 84; *Phil.* xiv. 14; *Brut.* 219; *de Div.* ii. 30\*; *Tusc.* i. 98

Without *-ne* (a few of these are doubtful):

*Fam.* iii. 10. 7?; iii. 12. 2 Lehmann; (Curius) vii. 29. 1?; (Caelius) viii. 17. 1; xi. 24. 1?; (Matius) xi. 28. 3\*; xiv. 1. 1\*; xiv. 2. 2. *Att.* ii. 6. 2; ii. 13. 1; v. 15. 1; v. 20. 7; vii. 2. 8; ix. 9. 2 doleo; ix. 10. 3; ix. 11. 3?; x. 14. 1\*; xii. 5. 1\* verb to be supplied; xii. 44. 2; xii. 49. 2; xiii. 22. 4 Tyrrell; xiv. 17. 3 exclam. acc. following; xiv. 19. 1?; xiv. 21. 3; xv. 10?; xv. 20. 1; *ad Brut.* i. 17. 4\*. *Verr.* i. 76; ii. 78; ii. 151\*; iii. 107; iii. 145\*; v. 61 (not in form); v. 100; v. 115 indirect. *Phil.* iii. 18\*; v. 16; x. 8; *Vat.* 16; *Brut.* 266 doleo. *Fin.* ii. 29; iv. 76; *Tusc.* ii. 21; *N.D.* i. 107 Mayor.

The above citations show the construction as occurring with the greatest frequency in the *Letters*, especially those to Atticus, and in the *Orations*, especially the Verrines and Philippics, where some of the examples show a literary power and a vehemence unapproachable.

<sup>1</sup>The *unequivocal nominative* in similar situations is infrequent and late; cf. Pliny *Pan.* 63: *o praua et inscia uerae maiestatis ambitio, concupiscere honorem quem dedigneris, dedignari quem concupieris . . . !*

## LIVY

The traditional statement made, e.g., by Wölfflin, *ALL*, VI, 101, that only once does this construction occur in Livy (ix. 11. 12) was unfortunately accepted by Canter, *The Infinitive Construction in Livy*, p. 86. To this should be added iii. 67. 1, quoted by Lane 2116, *cum pudore summo* in conspectum uestrum processi: hoc uos scire, hoc posteris memoriae traditum iri Aequos et Volscos, vix Hernicis modo pares, T. Quinctio quartum consule ad moenia urbis Romae impune armatos uenisse! A thorough search might discover others.

In the authors treated thus far the use of the construction has with unimportant exceptions, as e.g., Cic. *Verr.* v. 115, been confined to direct discourse. Livy's fondness, however, for indirect quotation has complicated the problem, and so we have to deal with the exclamatory infinitive in indirect discourse. A case in point is found in v. 45. 6: inde primum *miseratio* sui, deinde *indignitas* atque ex ea *ira* animos cepit: Etruscisne etiam, a quibus bellum Gallicum in se auertissent, ludibrio esse clades suas! By Canter this was classified as a rhetorical question in indirect discourse. A similar instance occurs in iii. 48. 8. A probable instance in indirect discourse without *-ne* is found in iii. 72. 3. On the other hand, xxvi. 29. 4, quoted by Kühner as an exclamatory infinitive is with greater probability to be taken as an indirect question. See Kraz, *op. cit.* pp. 13, 14.

From authors not previously considered may be cited the following: Cato, *Orat.* 41. 9 Jord. (Bennett is wrong in claiming *ibid.* 41. 5.) Pollio, 57. 3; see *ALL*, VI, 101. Seneca, *Brev. Vit.* 12. 8; *Const. Sap.* 18. 2. Justin. viii. 2. 12; xiv. 5. 7. Pliny *Pan.* 13; 80; 86.

None of these instances however illustrates anything new.

## EXCLAMATORY INFINITIVES IN GREEK

(Chronologically arranged)

- Aesch. *Ag.* 1662: ἀλλὰ τοῖσδ' ἐμοὶ ματαίαν γλῶσσαν ᾧδ' ἀπανθίσαι  
κάκβαλῆν ἔπη τοιαῦτα δαίμονος πειρωμένους  
σώφρονος γνώμης δ' ἀμαρτεῖν τὸν κρατοῦντα  
(θ' ἰβρίσαι).\*
- Eum.* 840 cf. 872: ἐμὲ παθεῖν τάδε, φεῦ  
ἐμὲ παλαιόφρονα, κατὰ τε γῆν οἰκεῖν  
ἀτίετον, φεῦ, μύσος.
- Soph. *Aj.* 410: ὦ δυστάλαινα, τοιάδ' ἄνδρα χρήσιμον  
φωνεῖν, ἃ πρόσθεν οὗτος οὐκ ἔτλη ποτ' ἄν.
- Eur. *Alc.* 832: ἀλλὰ σοῦ τὸ μὴ φράσαι  
κακοῦ τοσοῦτον δώμασιν προκειμένου.
- Med.* 1051: ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐμῆς κάκης,  
τὸ καὶ προσέσθαι μαλθακοὺς λόγους φρενί.



- Arist. *Nub.* 268: τὸ δὲ μὴδὲ κυνὴν οἴκοθεν ἐλθεῖν ἐμὲ τὸν κακοδαίμον'  
ἔχοντα.
- 818: ἰδοὺ γ' ἰδοὺ, Δί' Ὀλύμπιον · τῆς μωρίας,  
τὸ Δία νομίζειν ὄντα τηλικουτονί.  
τὸ Valekenaer, τὸν MSS.
- Vesp. 835: βάλλ' ἐς κόρακας · τοιουτονὶ τρέφειν κύνα.
- Av. 5: τὸ δ' ἐμὲ κορώνῃ πειθόμενον τὸν ἄθλιον  
ὁδοῦ περιελθεῖν στάδια πλείν ἢ δώδεκα.
- 7: τὸ δ' ἐμὲ κολοίφῃ πείθομενον τὸν δύσμορον  
ἀποσποδῆσαι τοὺς ὄνυχας τῶν δακτύλων.
- Soph. *Phil.* 234: ὦ φίλτατον φώνημα· φεῦ τὸ καὶ λαβεῖν  
πρόσφθεγμα τοιοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς ἐν χρόνῳ μακρῷ.
- Arist. *Ran.* 741: τὸ δὲ μὴ πατάξει σ' ἐξελεγχθέντ' ἀντικρυς,  
ὅτι δοῦλος ὢν ἔφασκες εἶναι δεσπότης.
- Eccl. 787: τῆς μωρίας,  
τὸ μὴδὲ περιμείναντα τοὺς ἄλλους ὃ, τι  
δράσουσιν εἰτα τηλικαῦτ' ἤδη — : τί δρᾶν;  
:: ἐπαναμένειν, ἔπειτα διατρίβειν ἔτι.
- Plut. 593: τὸ γὰρ ἀντιλέγειν τολμᾶν ὑμᾶς ὡς οὐ πάντ'  
ἔσθ' ἀγὰθ' ὑμῖν  
διὰ τὴν πενίαν.
- Xen. *Cyrop.* ii. 2. 3: τῆς τύχης, τὸ ἐμὲ νῦν κληθέντα δεῦρο τυχεῖν.
- Dem. xxi. 209: ἡ δεηθέντι τῷ τῶν πολλῶν προσσχοίεν ἄλλ' οὐκ εἰθέως  
ἂν εἴποιεν 'τὸν δὲ βάσκανον, τὸν δὲ ὀλεθρον, τοῦτον δὲ ὑβρί-  
ζειν ἀναπνεῖν δέ · ὃν εἴ τις ἐπ' ἑτῶν ἀγαπᾶν δέε' ;

See Reiske's *Index Graec.* under δέ, Goodwin's edition and Schaefer's *variorum*.

For the construction in general see Birklein in Schanz's *Beiträge*, pp. 29—31, 36, 41, 87. See also the Greek translation of Pacuvius 40 in Appian, *Bell. Civ.* ii. 146, cited on p. 71.

The main features of the exclamatory infinitive in Greek as illustrated in the examples quoted above may be summarized as follows: As in Latin, the infinitive clause expresses the fact producing the emotion, and the tenses used, present and aorist, have in each instance their full time value. This construction, like many other infinitive constructions, shows the tendency to assume greater definiteness by taking the article. Otherwise the development is less clearly marked than in Latin, or rather it leaves more to suggestion. The emotion produced is never indicated by a finite verb on which the infinitive

clause depends, as so often is seen in Latin, but by a preliminary exclamatory word or phrase in the nom.-voc. (*Ajax* 410), gen. (*Alc.* 832; *Med.* 1051; *Nub.* 818; *Eccl.* 787; *Cyrop.* ii. 2. 3), acc. (*Dem.* xxi. 209), or by an interjection (*Eum.* 840 [872]; *Phil.* 234), or by an adversative conjunction denoting surprise or opposition (*Ag.* 1662; *Alc.* 832; *Med.* 1051) or by a curse (*Vesp.* 835). Sometimes the emotion is expressed by an adjective within the infinitive clause (*Nub.* 268; *Av.* 5, 7) and sometimes the emotion must be gathered from the general context (*Ran.* 741; *Plut.* 593; *App. Civ.* ii. 146). Two of the instances express pleasure—*Soph. Phil.* 234, where the construction is introduced by ὦ φίλτατον φώνημα, but in *Ran.* 741 the pleasant surprise must be gathered from the general context. In Greek minuscule MSS the punctuation ; or the equivalent frequently occurs with the construction. This is to be explained (like the instances in Latin with -ne) on the hypothesis that an exclamation generally is interrogative in a *psychological* sense only, i.e., in *origin* and in *form*, but not in *effect*.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

### THE ARGILETUM AND THE ROMAN BOOK-TRADE

The discussions in Latin writers as to the origin of the word *Argiletum* have at least this value, that they imply that the name was first given to some limited spot because of its connection either with beds of clay (*argilla*), or with the death (*letum*) of a legendary *Argus*. The first conjecture is the more plausible, though the second one was adopted by Vergil (*Aen.* viii. 346), by Martianus Capella in his statement (iii. 273) that, in pronunciation, the word had the acute, grave, and circumflex accents, and by Martial (i. 117: *Argi nempe soles subire letum*), though Martial in the use of tmesis is perhaps only playing with the word, or possibly wishing to rival the *saxo cere comminuit brum* of Ennius. These and other etymologies from several ancient authors are conveniently brought together in the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*.

But the word, whatever its derivation and whatever the locality to which it was first applied, became the name of a street which started from the Roman Forum, near the temple of Janus (Livy i. 19; Servius on *Aen.* vii. 607), and ran in a northeasterly direction between the Curia and the Basilica Aemilia, and then on to its junction with the Subura (Mart. ii. 17). Evander in escorting Aeneas about his capital, on the way from the Lupercal to the Tarpeian Rock, points out the grove (*nemus*) of the Argiletum, but Vergil's description of this promenade (*Aen.* viii. 307 ff.) was not intended to be a topographical map. The Argiletum was probably connected on the north with the important Vicus Longus and Vicus Patricius, and on the south with the Vicus Sandaliarius, and was absorbed in or skirted the Forum of Nerva. It thus united the heart and great rendezvous of Rome with some of its most populous sections. Two letters from Cicero to Atticus (i. 14; xii. 32) suggest the value of property on that avenue.

Such a thoroughfare must have been a desirable locality for stores and shops of all kinds, but definite references to such a use of the Argiletum are disappointingly few. Inscriptions are often helpful in locating particular trades and industries, but no known inscription throws any light on the kinds of business done on this street. Literary allusions to the street as a mart are apparently found only in Martial. He says (ii. 17) that the Argiletum was besieged by shoemakers (*Argique letum multus obsidet sutor*). Three times (i. 2; i. 3; i. 117) he connects it with the sale of his own poems, though the merchants Atreetus and Secundus may have been one and the same individual. These three passages appear to be the only foundation for the sweeping generalization which appears in many books on Rome and in

editions of Martial, that the Argiletum was the center of the book-trade, a kind of "Pater Noster Row" of Rome.

All that we really know is that about 86 A.D. Atrectus and Secundus, or perhaps Atrectus Secundus, sold the epigrams of Martial on the Argiletum. The poet had at least two other publishers, Pollius (i. 113) and Tryphon (iv. 72), but nothing is known as to their location. One of the three passages (i. 2) distinctly implies that books were sold in many parts of the city (*urbe tota*).

Aulus Gellius twice refers (ii. 3; v. 4) to the sale of books in the Sigillaria (Image Market?), an unknown locality. He also writes (xviii. 4) of having been in different bookstores (*apud librarios*) on the Vicus Sandaliarius (Sandal St.). Galen asserts (Vol. XIX, p. 8, Kühn) that most of the Roman bookstores were on this street (*ἐν τῷ Σανδαλιάρῳ καθ' ὃ δὴ πλείστα τῶν ἐν Ῥώμῃ βιβλιοπωλείων ἐστὶ*).

Porphyrio and Pseudo-Acro, in their notes on Horace (*Ep.* i. 20.1), say that books were on sale in front of the temples of Vertumnus and Janus, i.e., in the Vicus Tuscus and inside the Forum. Pseudo-Acro adds that the Sosii, Horace's publishers, had book-stalls at the Rostra. These brothers were probably not that poet's only publishers. The epitaph of P. Cornelius Celadus (*CIL*, VI, 9515) tells us that near the Porta Trigemina he had been a *librarius*, i.e., a bookseller or, perhaps, a copyist or amanuensis.

This examination of the available evidence goes to show that the book-trade in Rome was somewhat widely distributed, and that, at least in the second century A.D., it was especially prominent, not in the Argiletum, but in the Vicus Sandaliarius.

TRACY PECK

ROME  
April, 1913

#### ON THE MEANING OF *BIDUUM* IN CERTAIN PHRASES

It would seem to be of primary importance in dealing with questions of chronology in the ancient authors that the exact significance be determined of such constantly recurring temporal expressions as *biduo post* [*ante*], *post* [*ante*] *biduum*.

These phrases are usually understood to mean "on the second day afterward [before]"; yet in a recent article by Professor J. C. Rolfe, in *Classical Philology* VIII (1913), 1-7, the view is put forth that in some passages, at least, *biduo ante* is equivalent to *pridie eius diei*, rather than *ante tertium diem*, and that the possibility of such interpretation "should be considered in all cases where the time is not otherwise defined." Analogous renderings are given to *biduo post* and *post* [*ante*] *biduum*.

On a priori grounds it is unreasonable, I take it, to consider that the Romans would make use of a temporal expression so indeterminate in its

significance as to permit hearer or reader to err by one day in computations in which but a few days are considered. It follows that if one meaning be established for these phrases throughout the body of Latin literature, a very strong case must be made out for an alternative meaning; for ambiguity in such expressions deprives them instantly of all value in fixing the relative time of two events.

In the determination of the force of *biduum* in the expressions noted above there would seem to be every reason to expect that the use of *triduum* and *quadriduum* in analogous phrases would furnish aid; but in no passage known to me is the significance of *triduum* or *quadriduum* in such phrases defined with sufficient accuracy to be of service. As *biennium*, *triennium*, etc., are of an entirely different order of magnitude, we cannot use *biennio ante*, etc., as parallels. Expressions such as *biduo serius*, however, and *biduo brevius* certainly may be grouped with *biduo ante*, and I contend that by no logical course of reasoning may we divorce the interpretation of *biduo ante* from the interpretation of the entire group wherein *biduo* is an ablative of degree of difference.

With this point in mind let us consider Seneca *Consolatio ad Helviam Matrem* 15. 2-3. In this passage Seneca tells how Helvia, knowing nothing of her son's impending doom, left him shortly before his exile and thus forfeited the final grace of seeing him during the brief hours remaining before his banishment. "Nam hoc quoque adversus te crudeliter fortuna molita est, quod te *ante tertium* demum *diem* quam percussus sum, securam nec quicquam tale metuentem regredi voluit. . . . Si multo ante afuisses, fortius tulisses ipso intervallo desiderium molliente; si non recessisses, ultimum certe fructum *biduo* diutius videndi filium tulisses." Now an integral part of Mr. Rolfe's argument is the train of reasoning which leads from the Roman inclusive system of reckoning<sup>1</sup> to the identification of *ante tertium diem* with *triduo ante*, and of *pridie eius diei* with *biduo ante*. The passage quoted proves that such reasoning is unfounded, and equates *biduo ante* to *ante diem tertium*.

Further confirmation of this view may be found in Cicero *Ep. ad Fam.* xi. 13. 2. The situation is as follows: after the battle of Mutina the opposing forces spent the night under arms on the battlefield<sup>2</sup> and on the following morning Antony retreated; owing to a complication of causes, as Decimus Brutus tells Cicero in the passage quoted, no pursuit was entered upon immediately. "Sequi confestim Antonium his de causis, Cicero, non potui: eram sine equitibus, sine iumentis; Hirtium perisse nesciebam, Aquilam perisse nesciebam; Caesari non credebam priusquam convenissem et

<sup>1</sup> In illustrating this well-known method of computation by mention of "*decem menses* as the period of gestation," Mr. Rolfe would seem to be in error: this period is quite commonly reckoned as ten *lunar* months.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Appian *Bellum Civile* iii. 71 ff.

conlocutus essem. Hic dies [i.e., the day following the battle, upon which Antony began his retreat] hoc modo abiit. Postero die mane a Pansa sum accersitus Bononiam. Cum in itinere essem, nuntiatum mihi est eum mortuum esse. Recurri ad meas copias; sic enim vere eas appellare possum; sunt extenuatissimae et inopia omnium rerum pessime acceptae. *Biduo* me Antonius antecessit. . . ." On the day following the battle, then, Antony began his retreat. Brutus spent this day in a conference with Octavian and in learning the true state of affairs. On the second day after the battle he made a fruitless march toward Bononia and returned to Mutina on hearing of the consul Pansa's death. It is entirely improbable that Brutus started on that very day in pursuit of Antony; the condition of his army was deplorable, as he himself states; again, he is writing to Cicero to excuse his apparent lack of aggressiveness in allowing Antony to escape, and would have every reason to mention such a shining example of this quality as immediate pursuit under such conditions.<sup>1</sup> Here, then, we have another clear case where *biduo*, as an ablative of degree of difference, refers to two full days, completely excluding any possibility of the use of the inclusive system of reckoning.

In Pliny *N.H.* xi. 210 ff., the sow's matrix, a Roman delicacy, is mentioned, with some account of the times when it is best to kill a sow: "Vulva eiecto partu melior quam edito. Eiecticia vocatur illa, haec porcaria. Primiparae suis optima, contra effetis. A partu, praeterquam eodem die suis occisae, livida ac macra. Nec novellarum suum praeter primiparas probatur, potiusque veterum, dum ne effetarum, nec *biduo ante partum* aut post partum aut quo eiecerint die. Proxima ab eiecticia est occisae *uno die post partum*." I fail to see how the occurrence of *biduo post* side by side with *uno die post* can be reconciled with the theory that *biduo ante* is equivalent to *pridie*—unless *uno die ante* is made equivalent to *hodie*!

Next we may consider the two passages which are cited by Mr. Rolfe as conflicting with his theory. Val. Max. 1. 8. ext. 1: "quae minus admirabilia fere Eris Pamphyli casus facit, quem Plato scribit inter eos qui in acie ceciderant decem diebus iacuisse, *biduoque post* quam inde sublatus esset, impositum rogo revivisse." Reference to Plato's *Republic* 614B shows that the resuscitation of Er took place on the twelfth day after his apparent death—on the second day following the recovery of his body, which lay for ten days on the field of battle. It is therefore quite impossible to equate *biduo post* to *postero die*.

Even more significant than this is Cicero *pro Quintio* 79 f. Cicero is here examining a witness in an effort to establish the date of the issuance of a praetor's writ in Rome, and that of the ejection of his client from his estate in Gaul in consequence of this writ. "Bona postulas ut ex edicto possidere liceat. Quo die? . . . 'Ante diem V Kalend. intercalaris.' . . . De saltu

<sup>1</sup> Further discussion of this point is contained in Tyrrell and Purser, *The Correspondence of Cicero*, VI, 144, note; O. E. Schmidt, *N. Jhb.*, CXLV (1892), 328 f.

deicitur Quinctius—quo die? . . . Deicitur de saltu, C. Aquili, pridie Kalend. intercalaris; *biduo post* aut, ut statim de iure aliquis cucurrerit, *non toto triduo* DCC milia passuum conficiuntur. . . . Administri et satellites Sex. Naevi Roma trans Alpes in Sebagninos *biduo* veniunt." Two entire days elapse between the praetor's judgment and the dispossession of Quinctius. If a messenger started on the very day of the trial, he arrived, according to the testimony, on the third day thereafter—*non toto triduo <post>*. If, however, this messenger set forth from Rome on the morning of the day following the trial, he arrived on the second day thereafter—*biduo post*. However greatly we stress Cicero's desire to make the elapsed time seem as short as possible, we cannot but admit that all possibility of the equivalence of *biduo post* to *postero die* is definitely excluded, nor may we deny the complete parallelism of *biduo post*, as here used, to all other instances of its use.

To these passages may be added others from the Latin of later periods. Such citations show definitely that the meaning which I have defended is the one current in later times, and it is to be remarked that at no period is change to be expected in an established usage of this nature. Vulgate, Lev. 19:6-7: "Eo die quo fuerit immolata <hostia,> comedetis eam, et die altero; quicquid autem residuum fuerit in diem tertium, igne comburetis. Si quis *post biduum* comederit ex ea, profanus erit, et impietatis reus." In this passage *post biduum* must mean "after two days," i.e. the day of the sacrifice and the following day.

In Anthimus *De Observatione Ciborum Epistula* 24—written in the sixth century—are recorded the following remarks on the preparation of peafowl for the table: "De pavonibus vero si fuerint illi maxime qui sunt seniores, ante V aut VI dies occiduntur. . . . Minores vero pavones vel teneriores *ante unam diem* aut *biduum* occiduntur." The contrast between *ante unam diem* and *ante biduum*—reminiscent of the passage quoted above from Pliny—directly refutes any claim that *biduo ante* is equivalent to *pridie*.

Such are the passages which established the rule that *biduo ante* is equivalent to *ante tertium diem*. Mr. Rolfe's citations in support of the view that *biduo ante* is synonymous with *pridie* are in great part "doubtful cases in which haste or speedy action is implied or called for by the context." In view of the purely subjective nature of the interpretation of such passages, I shall not enter upon a detailed discussion of his citations, but content myself with brief comment upon the three cases which he deems most convincing.

In Caesar *B.G.* i. 47. 1-2, is described the aftermath of the treacherous attack of Ariovistus' horsemen upon Caesar's legionaries. "*Biduo post* Ariovistus ad Caesarem legatos mittit. . . . Colloquendi Caesaris causa visa non est, et eo magis quod *pridie eius diei* Germani retineri non poterant quin in nostros tela coicerent." Surely *biduo post* has here its customary significance; any apparent conflict between this expression and *pridie eius*



*diei* must be ascribed to the terseness of Caesar's account. The first assault was followed on the next day, as I interpret it, by a succession of skirmishes which ceased when Ariovistus decided to seek a second conference. It is manifestly unfair to assume arbitrarily that the Germans made but one attack, and so force upon *biduo post* equivalence with *postero die*.

In Capitolinus *Vita M. Antonini Philosophi* 27. 11, we read: "*Ante biduum* quam exspiraret <Antoninus> admissis amicis dicitur ostendisse sententiam de filio eandem quam Philippus de Alexandro, cum de hoc male sentiret"; in 28. 4 ff.: "*Sexta die* vocatis amicis . . . . dixit . . . . et cum ab eo quaereretur cui filium commendaret, ille respondit 'Vobis, si dignus fuerit, et dis immortalibus'. . . . (28. 8) *Septimo die* gravatus est . . . . sed nocte animam efflavit." In the second account Aurelius addressed his friends on the day before his death. Mr. Rolfe argues that this renders *ante biduum* equivalent to *pridie*. But the dissimilarity in the content and style of these two accounts of Marcus Aurelius' death is quite sufficient to show that sections 27 and 28 are drawn from different sources by the compiler. This is the view held by Peter in his edition (1884) of the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, and by M. Lécivain, *L'histoire Auguste*, pp. 132-33. In the careless patching together of the biography of Marcus Aurelius from these different sources accurate chronological consistency is hardly to be expected.

In Suetonius *Julius* 43.1: "diremit nuptias praetorii viri, qui digressam a marito *post biduum* statim duxerat," Mr. Rolfe notes that "the offense of the ex-praetor is, however, considerably emphasized if we take *post biduum* to mean 'on the following day' and that this is the correct rendering is also suggested by *statim*." But a remarriage on the second day after divorce was surely indecent enough in haste not to require an unnatural meaning of *biduum* to emphasize it duly, and *statim* calls attention properly to this fact; here as elsewhere *post biduum* means "after two days."

In Livy xxxvi. 38. 7, the surrender of the Boii is said to have occurred *post eam pugnam extemplo*; in xxxvi. 40. 3, *biduo post pugnam*. In the former passage *extemplo* merely points the fact that the Boii laid down their arms after trying their fortune in but one battle; in the latter instance, the more definite information conveyed by *biduo post*, "two days after the battle," in no way conflicts with the former statement.

Finally, in Suetonius *Augustus* x. 4: "priore <proelio> Antonius fugisse eum [=Octavianum] scribit ac sine paludamento equoque *post biduum* demum apparuisse," there is absolutely no reason, as *demum* tells us, why we should interpret *post biduum* as meaning anything else than "after two days." The wording necessitates this interpretation, and we must discount the historical probability of the account by considering that this is certainly an idle rumor spread by Antony.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Gardthausen, *Augustus* I, 1, pp. 101 f.

The evidence here presented quite conclusively proves, in my opinion, that the phrases *post [ante] biduum*, *biduo post [ante]*, mean only "on the second day afterward."

CLINTON C. CONRAD

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

### THE GENUINENESS OF CICERO'S *PRO MURENA*

In a strange article entitled "Ist die Rede Ciceros pro Murena echt?" (*Znaim Progr.*, 1911), Stephan Haupt seeks to prove that the speech is not Ciceronian, but was written by Poggio, principally to make sport of the jurists of his own time. He bases his claim chiefly on the fact, as he will have it, that no quotations of the speech in antiquity exist, and on his belief that Serv. Sulpicius Rufus was not old enough for the consulship of 62. Several reviews of the work have appeared (see *W. kl. Ph.* [1912], 1290 by A. Kornitzer; *Zö. Gy.* [1912], 865-72 by A. Kornitzer, 956 by R. Bitschowsky; *B. ph. W.* [1912], 1793 by W. Sternkopf). They all condemn him; but they have not noted some of the most telling arguments in favor of the genuineness of the speech, in answer to an attack like that of Haupt.

In the first place, attention should be called to the work of A. C. Clark. *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, X (1905), in which Clark shows that  $\Sigma$ =cod. Paris, 14749, containing the *Pro Murena*, is free from any influence of Poggio. It was copied in France before the Cluniacensis was carried by Poggio to Italy. This fact takes away all force from Haupt's contention that the speech is a falsification by Poggio.

In reply to his assertion that Pliny, *Ep.* i. 20. 7, proves that the speech existed only in outline in his time, it is sufficient to note that he bases it on a reading in Baiter and Kayser, *Cicero*, vol. xi, p. 5, which omits the "quorundam" before "criminum."

He is mistaken, I think, in saying that no quotations of the speech exist in antiquity. A collection of the quotations—complete, I believe—may be useful. For the passages in Quintilian, which Haupt declares false, see Halm's ed. (p. 376). Halm, *Rhetores Latini Minores* (I cite by page and line): 26, 21; 31, 5 (Aquila Romanus); 42, 31; 47, 22; 75, 9 (Julius Rufinianus); 403, 23 (Julius Victor). Keil, *Grammatici Latini*: Vol. I, 82, 5 (Charisius); Vol. II, 221, 3; 307, 16; 339, 20; 343, 14; 381, 14; 491, 18; 592, 2; Vol. III, 74, 21; 283, 7 (Priscianus); Vol. VI, 446, 8 (Marius Plotius Sacerdos); Vol. VII, 464, 14; 479, 2; 481, 27; 499, 20 (Arus. Messius). *Scholía Bobiensia* (ed. P. Hildebrandt, 1907): 36, 19=Orelli, 232; 49, 13=Orelli, 242; 139, 29=Orelli, 263; 146, 23=Orelli, 269. Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* vii. 1. 1. Orosius, I. 8. 8.

Haupt's argument that Serv. Sulpicius Rufus was only old enough to try for the consulship of 52, not of 62, can be refuted even without the

passage in *Brutus* (40.150) whose conclusiveness, even though the passage is genuine, he doubts. *Ad Att.* ii. 5. 2 certainly shows Rufus old enough for the consulship of 58. Pomponius (*Dig.* I. ii. 2. 43) tells an anecdote of Rufus and Q. Mucius Scaevola, the pontifex maximus, who was killed early in 82. Rufus is spoken of as already a pleader, so that he evidently would be old enough to try for the consulship in 63. Still more conclusive is the evidence from *Philipp.* IX. i. 1: "Reditus eius et vobis gratus fuerit et rei publicae salutaris futurus, non quo L. Philippo et L. Pisoni aut studium aut cura defuerit . . . sed cum Ser. Sulpicius aetate illis anteiret, sapientia omnibus, subito ereptus e causa totam legationem orbam et debilitatam reliquit." Rufus was then older than L. Philippus, consul in 56, and older than L. Piso, consul in 58. A difference of five years between them and Rufus is not too much to assume. This will make Rufus old enough for the consulship of 62.

So, on examination, Haupt's proofs are seen to be valueless, and the *Pro Murena* stands in little danger of losing its claim to Ciceronian authorship.

G. A. HARRER, JR.

PRINCETON, N. J.  
January 27, 1913

## BOOK REVIEWS

---

*Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular.* Grammar, Texts, Glossary. By ALBERT THUMB. Translated from the second improved and enlarged German edition by S. ANGUS. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912.

The well-known excellence of Thumb's *Handbuch der neugriechischen Vulgärsprache* has been enhanced in the second edition of 1910, which is now before us in English dress. The translation is done with skill and thorough comprehension of the subject-matter. I have noted nothing to criticize more important than an initial inconsistency in the rendering of technical terms (on pp. 4, 5, *tönender* appears as "sonant," "sounding," and "voiced," and *tonloser* as "unvoiced" and "voiceless"), or an occasional phrase which has an odd sound in English. A number of misprints and other slight errors or omissions in the German edition, some of which had been pointed out in reviews of the latter, have been corrected. A still uncorrected reference which I have happened on is the first under *vá* in the Glossary: for § 170, correct for the first edition, read § 218.

The fact that the translation is brought out by a publishing firm which handles primarily theological literature is significant of the recognized importance of Modern Greek to the study of New Testament Greek. Some acquaintance with Modern Greek is also essential to the increasing number of our classical students who are able to enjoy a visit of some length in Greece, and is unquestionably of the greatest value and interest to all students of ancient Greek, and to all interested in general linguistic development. For there is no other language the known history of which covers so long a period as Greek, and none which furnishes more interesting illustrations of various phases of linguistic development than modern, in its relation to ancient Greek. It is the especial merit and distinction of Thumb's book that it furnishes a practical and at the same time scientific account of the vernacular, including local variations which are given with considerable fulness. It deals exclusively with the spoken language and does not confuse the picture by introducing features of the *καθαρεύουσα* or "purified" written language, which has formed the basis of the majority of manuals of Modern Greek. The inflectional types are not forced into the ancient molds, but are given a classification which seems best adapted to represent the present situation. At the same time the historical development is often hinted at in brief notes.

But if we were to offer any suggestion for a third edition, it would be

that, in deference to the main interest of the majority of those who will use the book,<sup>1</sup> the historical comments be introduced more freely, even at the expense of excising some of the information on the peculiarities of the remoter dialects. For, in spite of the fact that investigators in this field are none too numerous and that the articles of the most productive of these, Hatzidakis, are now mostly incorporated in either his *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik* or his *Μεσαιωνικά καὶ νέα Ἑλληνικά*, it is still no light task to run down the discussion of a given phenomenon. Thumb would render a service which would be appreciated by all, if, in connection with each inflectional type described, he should add a reference to the best discussion of its development or give the gist of the explanation. This last he has often done, as already remarked. But again, many an explanation which is simple enough, but not so obvious to the student as to be taken for granted, is lacking (e.g., of the third plural present active ending in *γράφουν* = *γράφουσι*), or a comment is so condensed that the student who does not know the fuller discussion upon which it is based will make nothing out of it (e.g., § 220.2, on the endings of the imperfect passive, or § 227.2, on the development of the perfect type *ἔχω δέσει*). Furthermore, the total lack of etymological notes in the Glossary, though the author has doubtless considered the question and decided adversely, is to my mind unfortunate. It is true that the source of a large percentage of the words is obvious, even where the meaning has greatly changed. It is unnecessary to state the source of *κά(μ)νω* "do, make," *τρώγω* "eat," *μιλῶ* (*ὀμιλῶ*) "speak," *σκοτώνω* "kill," and the like. It is less obvious that, for example, *παίρνω* "take, get" (e.g., in aorist, *πάρε τό* "take it," *ποῦ τὸ πήρε* "where did he get it?") comes from *ἐπαίρω* "raise up, lift," which appears in early church writings as the equivalent of *λαμβάνω*, or that *γλυτώνω* "rescue, escape, disappear" is connected with *ἐκλύω* "release." And who will suspect, without some hint, that *μαλώνω* "quarrel, scold" is connected with *ὀμαλός* "even, level" (whence the verb "make even, level, correct, scold"; cf. our euphemistic use of "correct")?

It may not be unwelcome to readers of *Classical Philology* if I make this brief notice of Thumb's book the occasion to summarize the most significant characteristics of the modern inflectional system in its relation to that of the ancient language.<sup>2</sup> The changes in pronunciation are more familiar and

<sup>1</sup> I mean that of those who look for something more than a brief practical account of the common vernacular, such as is furnished by Wied's little book translated by Mrs. Gardner, more are interested in the historical explanation of the usual vernacular forms in their relation to ancient Greek than in the dialectic variations. This is by no means to underrate the importance of these latter to the specialist or to fail to appreciate the convenience to him of having these brought together in systematic form. And some of them of course help to shed light on the history of the common forms.

<sup>2</sup> The most concise statement of the facts, all comments on the historical development being omitted, is given by Hatzidakis, *Περὶ τῆς χρήσεως τῶν γραμματικῶν τύπων*

need not be reviewed here, but must be borne in mind as an essential factor in much, though not all, of the widespread analogical leveling which has taken place. Most important is the identity in sound of  $\iota$ ,  $\eta$ ,  $\epsilon\alpha$ ,  $\omicron\alpha$ , and  $\upsilon$ , of  $\alpha\iota$  and  $\epsilon$ , of  $\alpha\upsilon$ ,  $\epsilon\upsilon$  with  $\alpha\phi$ ,  $\epsilon\phi$ , or  $\alpha\beta$ ,  $\epsilon\beta$ , etc., though the resulting leveling is often disguised by the customary retention of the etymological spelling, or, in some cases, what is falsely believed to be the etymological spelling.

## NOUNS

*Number.*—There is no dual. This has been obsolete in the spoken language for over two thousand years.

*Cases.*—The dative case has gone out of use. The indirect object, in the widest sense, is expressed by the genitive (or accusative; see below) or by the prepositional phrase  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  ('s,  $\sigma\epsilon$ ) with the accusative. Thus  $\tau\omicron\upsilon \dot{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon \tau\omicron \beta\iota\beta\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron$  "gave him the book" (so regularly with pronouns, unless emphatic as  $\dot{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon \tau\omicron \beta\iota\beta\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron$  's  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon$  "gave the book to him"),  $\dot{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon \tau\omicron\upsilon \pi\alpha\iota\delta\iota\omicron\upsilon \tau\omicron \beta\iota\beta\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron$  "gave the boy the book" or  $\dot{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon \tau\omicron \beta\iota\beta\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron$  's  $\tau\omicron \pi\alpha\iota\delta\acute{\iota}$ . This use of the genitive developed out of the possessive genitive, like the corresponding substitution in Old Persian and elsewhere, for which cf. Delbrück, *Vergl. Syntax*, I, 192 ff. Where the accusative<sup>1</sup> is used (e.g.,  $\tau\omicron\upsilon \dot{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon \tau\omicron \beta\iota\beta\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron$ ), this is simply an extension of its use as the direct object, the difference between direct and indirect object being shown only by the word-order, just as in present English, except where a prepositional clause is employed.

Other uses of the dative and many of the old uses of the genitive are replaced by prepositional phrases, all prepositions being followed by the accusative, e.g.,  $\sigma\kappa\omicron\tau\acute{\omega}\theta\eta\kappa\epsilon \alpha\pi\omicron \tau\omicron\upsilon \alpha\delta\epsilon\rho\phi\acute{\omicron}\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon$  "he was killed by his brother,"  $\dot{\epsilon}\phi\upsilon\gamma\epsilon \alpha\pi\omicron \tau\omicron \sigma\pi\acute{\iota}\tau\iota$  "he fled from the house." Since there is a distinct vocative form only for  $\omicron$ -stems, we have generally, much as in English, a three-case system which is often further reduced to two by the frequent identity of the nominative and accusative forms.

*ἐν τῇ γραφικῇ ἡμῶν γλώσσῃ.* For each inflectional class are distinguished: (1) ancient forms which are wholly obsolete; (2) ancient forms which are still used in the written language; (3) ancient forms which survive in the spoken language; (4) new forms in the spoken language. We are concerned here only with the last two categories.

<sup>1</sup> In the singular the use of the accusative is northern, that of the genitive southern, but the latter construction tends to become the standard. In the plural, however, the accusative forms are practically universal, just as they are also used in real genitive constructions. The normal is, then,  $\tau\omicron\upsilon \dot{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon$  but  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \dot{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon$ , as also  $\tau\omicron \delta\iota\kappa\acute{\omicron} \tau\omicron\upsilon$  "his" but  $\tau\omicron \delta\iota\kappa\acute{\omicron} \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  "their." Some of the statements of Thumb, § 54(b), are misleading. He says that "the Epirote *Zalakovstas*—in contrast to the Epirotes *Bhlapas* and *Balawpitis*—uses the accusative in his tales from Epirus (*Texts*, I. d. 1, 2, 3)." But these tales show the accusative in the plural, but the genitive in the singular, exactly as do the writings of *Πάλλης* and others whom Thumb cites as using the genitive. Thus, in the second tale,  $\sigma\omicron\upsilon \delta\acute{\omega}\kappa\omega$ ,  $\tau\omicron\upsilon \epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon$ ,  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon \tau\eta\varsigma \mu\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon$ , but  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \dot{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon$ ,  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon$  (just as in the possessive construction, in the last line,  $\tau\eta \gamma\upsilon\upsilon\alpha\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha \tau\omicron\upsilon$ , but  $\tau\eta \zeta\omega\acute{\eta} \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ ). The practice of *Ψυχάρης*, whom Thumb also cites among those using the accusative, is precisely the same (genitive singular, accusative plural), wherever I have consulted his writings.

*First declension.*—The nominative and accusative plural end in *-es*, e.g., *τρεῖς* (ἡ) *μέρες*. Although frequently written *-aus*, owing to a false notion of its origin, the ending is *-es*, taken over from the third declension,<sup>1</sup> where the nominative plural form had come to be used for the accusative in Hellenistic times (in some dialects much earlier; cf. my *Greek Dialects*, § 107.4). The earliest examples of transfer to the first declension are *ἐχούσες* = *ἐχοῦσας* in an Epidaurian inscription of the first century A.D. (*IG*, IV, 940), and *ἄλλες, ταῦτες* = *ἄλλας, ταύτας* in a Rhodian inscription of a not much later date (*IG*, XII, i, 937). Another plural formation, and one of growing popularity, is that in *-des*, after the analogy of dental stems, e.g., *παπᾶς*, pl. *παπάδες, μαθητῆς*, pl. *μαθητάδες* beside *μαθητές* (Thumb, §§ 70-79, 88-90).

In the singular, extensive leveling, beginning in Hellenistic times, has removed all vowel variation. Thus *γλώσσα*, gen. *γλώσσης*, not *γλώσσης*, *θάλασσα*, gen. *θάλασσης* (note the leveling in accent also); similarly the masculines *παπᾶς*, gen. *παπᾶ* (as even in Attic for words in *-ās*), *κλέφτης*, gen. *κλέφτη*, not *κλέφτου*, and so in loan-words like *καφές*, gen. *καφέ*.

*The second declension.*—This is the one least changed. But the old feminines have changed either their gender or declension or been replaced by other words (Thumb, § 63.2). Diminutives in *-ί* from *-ίων*, as *παιδί*, gen. *παιδιοῦ*, pl. *παιδιά*, form an important class.

*The third declension.*—This has been in large measure merged with the first. The starting-point was the accusative singular. From consonant stems, forms in *-αν*, with *ν* added after the analogy of vowel stems, occasionally appear in the ancient dialects (cf. my *Greek Dialects*, § 107.1) and are very common in the *κοινή*, e.g., *ἄνδραν, παῖδαν, γυναῖκαν, μητέραν* (cf. especially Dieterich, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griech. Sprache*, pp. 159 ff.). The identity with the accusative of the first declension led to new nominatives in *-ας* or *-α* according to the gender, as *πατέρας* from *πατέραν* or *μητέρα* from *μητέραν*; and the genitive singular followed suit, hence *πατέρα, μητέρας*. But some masculines show *o*-stem forms in the genitive singular and in the plural. Thus *κόρακας*, gen. sing. *κόρακον*, acc. sing. *κόρακα*, nom. pl. *κόρακοι*, acc. pl. *κόρακους*. A genitive in *-ους* also occurs, as *ἄνδρους* to nom. *ἄνδρας*, this being a blend of *-ον* and the old

<sup>1</sup> So first G. Meyer, *Bezz. Beitr.*, I, 230 (cf. also XIX, 157), who thought the transfer was specifically induced by the large number of consonant stems which came to follow the first declension in the singular (see below). While it is not necessary to assume this as a factor, the possibility is not so definitely excluded on chronological grounds as is stated by Hatzidakis, *Μεσαιωνικά*, I, 12. For the earliest sporadic occurrences of nominative singular *-ας* or *-α* in consonant stems (not to mention the earlier accusatives in *-αν*) are nearly enough contemporaneous with those of *-ες* in vowel stems to render any decision as to their priority unsafe. Another question is whether, as Dieterich, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*, pp. 156 ff., states, the *-ες* came into the nominative plural of the first declension some centuries later than into the accusative, or if, as seems to me more probable, it is only accidental that the earliest occurrences are accusatives.



-ος which is occasionally preserved. Neuters like *ὄνομα* regularly have gen. sing. *ὀνομάτων*, etc.

In *ι*-stems the identity of the accusative singular with that of first declension feminines in *-η*, e.g., *πράξι(ν)* in pronunciation precisely like *κόρη(ν)*, led to a complete transfer to the latter type. Hence nom. *πράξη*, gen. *πράξης*, though the customary spelling is *πράξι*, gen. *πράξις*.

In the article the nom. pl. *οἱ* is also used for the feminine, e.g., *οἱ γλῶσσαι*. Some few examples occur in papyri, as *οἱ ἄνδρες καὶ οἱ γυναῖκες*. But, owing to a modern misunderstanding of its origin, the feminine form is commonly written *ῆ*. Cf. especially Psichari, *Essais de grammaire historique néo-grecque*, pp. 34 ff. In the accusative plural feminine, *τάς (ταῖς)* is now less common than *τίς (τῆς)*, with vowel assimilated to that of the nominative.

## ADJECTIVES

Besides those of the first and second declension, which are by far the most common, several *υ*-stem adjectives have survived, though with encroachment of *ο*-stem forms in many of the cases, and have even drawn some original *ο*-stems into this type. Thus not only *γλυκός, βαθύς, βαρύς*, etc., but also *μακρύς, πικρύς, ελαφρύς*. An especially interesting analogical extension is that of *-ντερος* from *γλυκύτερος*, etc., to *καλύτερος, μεγαλύτερος, πρωτότερος*, etc. (commonly spelled *-ητερος, -αιτερος, or -ιτερος*). There is also a periphrastic comparative formed by prefixing *πιο* "more" (from *πλέον*<sup>1</sup>) to the positive, e.g., *πιο ὁμορφος* "more beautiful." As in English, the periphrastic form is preferred when the adjective is polysyllabic or of participial origin. The superlative is formed by prefixing the article to the comparative, as *ὁ καλύτερος* "the best."

## PRONOUNS

*Personal pronouns.*—First person *ἐγώ*, gen. and acc. sing. *ἐμένα* (conjunctive *μοῦ, με*), based upon the old acc. *ἐμέ* which under the influence of other accusatives was extended first to *ἐμέν*, then to *ἐμέναν*<sup>2</sup>; plural

<sup>1</sup> *πλέον* gives regularly *πιο* whence, with loss of *λ*, *πιο*. So Thumb, §§ 32, 119, who makes no reference to the criticism of Kretschmer, *Der heutige lesbische Dialekt*, pp. 161 ff., 251 ff. Kretschmer believes that *πιο* cannot come from *πιο*, since *λι* regularly remains as palatalized *l*, but is borrowed from Italian *più* with *o* taken from *πιο*; and he finds support for this in the fact that the periphrastic type is especially common in the islands which have been most subject to Venetian and Genoese influence, while it is lacking in Epirus. But *πιο* is certainly the form used throughout almost the whole of the Greek mainland, and the assumption that it is from the Italian is far more daring than that of a phonetic loss of *λ*. For, though in most positions a change of *λι* to *ι* is limited to a few dialects (e.g., *πιοιό* = *πιοιό*, Siphnos), there is nothing to disprove that it was more general in the particular combination involved here.

<sup>2</sup> The first step, leading to *ἐμέν* (likewise *ἐσέν*), which occurs as early as the third century A.D. and is still in use in some dialects, is parallel to the extension of the accusative ending seen in *μητέρα*, etc., and was inevitable. But the precise source

ἡμεῖς, ἡμᾶς (conjunctive μᾶς) with ε instead of η after the analogy of the singular ἐγώ, ἐμένα. Second person ἐσύ beside σύ, gen. and acc. sing. ἐσένα (conjunctive σοῦ, σε), with ε after the analogy of ἐγώ, ἐμένα; plural ἐσεῖς, ἐσᾶς (conjunctive σεῖς, σᾶς) formed from the singular ἐσύ, etc., in place of the old ὑμεῖς which became identical in sound with ἡμεῖς.<sup>1</sup> For the third person αὐτός is used, or, when unemphatic, forms of the article. The old possessive pronouns are obsolete, their place being taken by the genitive of the pronoun, or, when emphatic or predicate, by δικός (from εἰδικός "special") and the genitive, e.g., εἶναι τὸ δικό μου "it is mine." The demonstratives are: αὐτός; τοῦτος from οὗτος, with generalization of τουτ- which is seen in some of the ancient dialects, also ἐτοῦτος with ἐ from ἐκείνος; and ἐκεῖνος.

The old τόσος, which in Attic prose is displaced by τοσοῦτος except in certain adverbial phrases, has again in turn driven out the latter.<sup>2</sup> Likewise τοῖος, for which Attic usually has τοιοῦτος, is preserved in τέτοιος "such a," which is a blend of τί and ἐτοῖος (cf. ἐτοῦτος above).<sup>3</sup>

The interrogative τίς is almost obsolete except in the form τί, which may be used with a noun of any gender, e.g., τί ὥρα εἶναι "what time is it?" The regular interrogative with full declension is now ποῖός (πόιος).

The indefinite τίς survives only in certain combinations, as τίποτε "anything, nothing," κάτι "some," etc. Its place is taken by κανείς (or κανένας), fem. καμμία, which is formed by prefixing κᾶν (= καὶ ἄν) to "one."

of the second extension, leading to ἐμένα (ἐσένα), which is attested from the twelfth century, is not wholly clear, in spite of what is suggested by W. Meyer, *Commentaire Simon Portius*, p. 164, and by Hatzidakis, *Μεσαιωνικά*, I, 56. According to the former, ἐμένα(ν) was formed after πατέρα(ν), etc.; while the latter thinks it was formed in part after other accusatives like τίνα(ν), δαίνα(ν), ἀνδρα(ν), γυναῖκα(ν), and in part often the analogy of certain increments common in pronouns, as in ἐκεῖνοδά, αὐτονά, etc., ἐκεῖνονέ, τουτονά, etc. But these forms in -α are themselves in need of explanation (those in -ε are explained as having ε detached from a following word, especially augmented verb-forms, e.g., τὸν ἐγνώρισα). Or does H. mean to suggest by his collocation of ἐκεῖνοδά (= ἐκεῖνο δά) with ἐκεῖνοά, etc., that the latter may contain νά "there"?

<sup>1</sup> The view that the loss of ὑμεῖς was due to its identity in sound with ἡμεῖς is criticized by Hatzidakis in his review of W. Meyer, *Simon Portius* (cf. *Μεσαιωνικά*, II, 467) on the ground that the new formation ἐσεῖς is earlier than the identity of η and υ. But though σεῖς, which W. Meyer thought not earlier than the twelfth century, is now attested in a papyrus of the sixth (Dieterich, *Untersuchungen*, p. 191), it is also true that confusion between υ and ι or η is frequent in papyri of the second and third centuries (Dieterich, p. 24). Whatever the date of the complete identity of υ and η (ι), it is evident that the resemblance was close enough at an early date to be a factor in the preference for the analogical σεῖς.

<sup>2</sup> Hence the occasional appearance of τόσος in papyri, noted by Mayser, *Grammatik der griech. Papyri*, p. 309, should occasion no surprise. The restoration of τόσος to general use was assisted by the correlatives πῶσος and ὅσος, which have held their place at all times.

<sup>3</sup> But see now Hatzidakis, *Idg. Forsch.*, XXXIII, 352 ff.

This gave rise to a feeling for an indefinite prefix *καν-* or *κα-* (note that the feminine is in pronunciation *κα-μία*), whence were formed *κάμποσος* "some-what large, rather large," *κάποιος* "somebody, some," *κάτι* "some" (used as an indeclinable adjective), and *κάτιτι* "something." The last-named forms are used positively, while *κανένας* and *τίποτε* are regularly employed with negatives, and, like French *pas*, *point*, etc., have absorbed the force of the accompanying negative, so that when used alone, as in answer to a question, they are themselves negative. Thus *κανένας* "nobody," *τίποτε* "nothing," and likewise *ποτέ* "never," *πουθενά* "nowhere."

*καθεὶς* (or *καθένας*) "each one, every one," fem. *καθεμία*, also indeclinable adjective *κάθε* (e.g., *κάθε βράδυ* "every evening"), is built up from the distributive phrase *καθ' ἕνα*.

The relative pronoun is now the indeclinable *ποῦ*, from an earlier *ὅπου* "where." For oblique cases the proper form of the conjunctive pronoun is generally added. Thus *τὸ παιδί ποῦ ἦρθε* "the boy who came," but *τὸ παιδί ποῦ τὸν ἔστειλα* "the boy whom I sent." *ὅποιος*, *ὅσος* and *ὅτι* are usual as indefinite relatives, e.g., *ὅποιος εἶναι* "whoever it is," *ὅσα θέλεις* "as much as you wish," *ὅτι ὅρα θέλεις* "whenever you wish."

## VERBS

*Voices*.—Instead of three voices there are now only two. The old middle and passive are merged in one, which is in form derived from the old passive. That is, where the two voices were differentiated in form, as in the aorist, it is the passive form which has survived, e.g., *γράφομαι*, aorist not *ἐγραψάμην*, but *ἐγράφηκα* or *ἐγράφητηκα* (*φτ* from *φθ*), formed by adding *κα* (which spread from active aorists like *ἔδωκα*) to the stems of *ἐγράφην* or *ἐγράφθην*. But the meaning is by no means exclusively passive, many of the uses of the old middle being retained. Deponents like *φοβοῦμαι*, *εφοβήθηκα* "am afraid, was afraid" are very numerous, likewise those which denote reflexive or reciprocal action, as *πλένομαι* "wash myself," *γνωρίζονται* "they recognize one another." The causative use (*ἰδιδάξαμην σε* "I had you taught" Ar.) gives rise to a peculiar idiom, especially common with negatives, as *πιάνεται* "lets himself be caught," *δέν πιάνεται* "is not to be caught," *τὸ κρασί δέν πίνεται* "the wine is not to be drunk, is not drinkable," *δέν τρώγεται* "is not eatable," etc. But the ancient use of the middle to denote action in one's own interest, etc., involved such a delicate and often vague distinction from the active that it is now almost wholly obsolete.<sup>1</sup>

*Moods*.—The old optative, which in the New Testament was already restricted to very narrow limits, has entirely disappeared. The subjunctive is used only with conjunctions, especially *νά* (from *ἵνα*), with which it has

<sup>1</sup> For the use of the voices cf. Thumb, §§ 175-177, and especially Hatzidakis, *IF*, XXV, 357 ff., and *περὶ τῆς χρήσεως τῶν μέσων, τῶν μεταβατικῶν καὶ ἀμεταβλῶν ῥημάτων ἐν τῇ νέῃ Ἑλληνικῇ* (Athens, 1911).



Romance future from *scribere habeo*, etc. But from "shall write" to "have written" there could be no direct transition. The explanation is found in the phrase *εἶχα γράφει*. As *ἔχω γράφει* was used like *θέλω γράφει*, so *εἶχα γράφει* like *ἤθελα γράφει*. That is, it had modal force, and may be compared to the Romance conditional from *scribere habebam*. Thus *γράφειν εἶχα καὶ πλείοτερον*, literally "I had more to write" but meaning simply "I might write more," *νὰ μὴ εἶχα σε γνωρίσει* "would that I did not know you" or also "would that I had not known you." From its use as a past modal the phrase came in time to be employed where there was no modal force, simply as a tense of past time, either perfect or pluperfect. The last step was that, owing to the parallelism with *εἶχα γραμμένο*, *εἶχα γράφει* became restricted to the pluperfect use, and a new perfect, *ἔχω γράφει* parallel to *ἔχω γραμμένο*, was formed to it.<sup>1</sup>

*Inflection of the present indicative active.*—*γράφω*, *γράφεις*, *γράφει*, *γράφομε* (or *-οιμε*), *γράφετε*, *γράφουν* or *γράφουνε*. The third plural owes its form to the interchange of the primary and secondary endings, which begins in early times. As *-αν* beside *-ασι* in the perfect in the last centuries B.C. (*ἀπέσταλκαν*, etc.), and conversely, some centuries later, *-ασι* beside *-αν* in the aorist (*εἵπασι*, etc.), so are found forms like *γράφουν* beside *γράφουσι*, and these ultimately prevailed, except in a few dialects which still preserve the old forms in *-ουσι*. In *γράφουνε* the *ε* is due to the analogy of the endings of the first and second plural.

The imperfect and the aorist active now have uniform inflection, a blend of the two original types. Thus imperfect *ἔγραφα*, *ἔγραφες*, *ἔγραφε*, *ἐγράφαμε*,<sup>2</sup> *ἐγράφετε* or *ἐγράφατε*, *ἔγραφαν* or *ἐγράφανε*; and aorist *ἔγραψα*, *ἔγραφες*, etc., in precisely the same way.

*Present indicative passive.*—*γράφομαι* (or *-ομαι*), *γράφεσαι*, *γράφεται*, *γραφόμεσθε* (or *-οίμασθε*), *γράφεσθε*, *γράφονται*. Forms like *γράφεσαι*, with *-σαι* after the analogy of *τίθειςαι*, etc., are already current in Hellenistic times. For the ending *-μασθε* and the *ου* in *γράφονται*, etc., see below under the imperfect.

*Imperfect passive.*—*ἐγράφουμουν*, *ἐγράφουσιν*, *ἐγράφονταν*, *ἐγραφούμασθε*, *ἐγραφούσατε*, *ἐγράφονταν*.<sup>3</sup> These forms, of which there are numerous variants, bear no apparent resemblance to the original, and it is safe to say that no other inflectional type has undergone such a wholesale transformation. While it is clear in general that this has taken place "through the mutual action of the different persons on one another and by the action of the active upon the passive" (Thumb, § 220.2), the question of the precise steps in this development offers several unsettled problems.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The chronological development, with numerous citations, is given by Hatzidakis, *Sitzungsber. Berl. Akad.* (1900), pp. 1088 ff., and *Μεσαιωνικά*, I, 598 ff.

<sup>2</sup> The augment is commonly omitted when unaccented.

<sup>3</sup> The most easily explained form is the third plural, in which the old *-οντο* blended with the active *-αν* into *-ονταν*. Forms like *ἔρχονταν* and also *ἐρχόντησαν* are those

*Contract verbs.*—Most of the old verbs in *-άω* and *-έω* are now inflected according to a uniform type, which shows a fusion of forms belonging to each of the two classes. Thus the present of *ῥωτῶ* "ask" (*ἑρωτάω*): *ῥωτῶ*, *ῥωτᾶς* or *ῥωτάεις*, *ῥωτᾷ* or *ῥωτάει*, *ῥωτοῦμε*, *ῥωτᾶτε*, *ῥωτοῦν(ε)*; of *φοβοῦμαι* "fear" (deponent): *φοβοῦμαι*, *φοβᾶσαι*, *φοβᾶται*, *φοβούμεσθε*, *φοβᾶστε*, *φοβοῦνται*. The forms *ῥωτάεις* and *ῥωτάει* are not, of course, relics of uncontracted inflection, but are new formations of *ῥωτᾶς* and *ῥωτᾷ* with endings after the analogy of *γράφεις*, *γράφει*. The imperfect active is *ἔρωτοῦσα*, *ἔρωτοῦσες*, etc. This is built up from such Hellenistic third plurals as *παρεκάλουνσαν*, etc., with *-σαν* from the *σ-* aorist.

*The verb "To be."*—Present *εἰμαι*, *εἶσαι*, *εἶναι*, *εἴμαστε*, *εἴστε*, *εἶναι*. Imperfect *ἦμουν(α)*, *ἦσουν(α)*, *ἦταν(ε)* or *ἦτον(ε)*, *ἦμαστε*, *ἦσατε*, *ἦταν(ε)* or *ἦτον(ε)*. Middle forms begin to appear in Hellenistic Greek, as *ἤμην*, *ἤμεθα* in the New Testament, etc. (cf. also pres. subj. *ἦται* in a Delphian, *ἦνται* in a Messenian, inscription). The present indicative took on middle endings later, and after *εἰ* of *εἰμί* had been extended to other forms as *εἰμέν* for earlier *ἐσμέν*. *εἶναι* comes from *εἶνι* (= *εἶνεστι*), which was used, like French *il y a*, in the sense of "there is," "there are," and later as a simple copula. The change in the vowels is due to the analogy of *εἰμαι*, *εἶσαι*.

regularly employed, for example, in the Chronicle of Morea. The *ου* which now prevails before all the endings in the imperfect and also in the present *γράφουνται* (and sometimes *γράφουμαι*, *γραφούμαστε*) is ascribed to the influence of the active *γράφουν*. But a contributory factor certainly, at least in the spread of *ου* from the third plural, was the influence of the contract verbs. Among forms with middle endings the strongest contingent of those in most common use is furnished by the contract deponents like *φοβοῦμαι*, *κοιμῶμαι*, *λιπούμαι*, *θυμούμαι*, etc.; and they have *ου* in the imperfect throughout, and in the present in the same three persons which may have *ου* in *γράφουμαι*, e.g., *φοβοῦμαι* but *φοβᾶσαι* (cf. Thumb, § 241).

In the third singular *ἐγράφετο* became *ἐγράφετον* with *ν* added after the analogy of the active *εἶπεν*, *ἔλεγεν*, etc. Such forms begin to appear in late inscriptions (Hatzidakis, *Einleitung*, p. 111), are regular in mediaeval writings (e.g., *ἐγένετον*, *ἔρχετον*, *ἐδρίσκετον*, etc., Chronicle of Morea), and Simon Portius in the seventeenth century still gives *ἐγράφετον* beside *ἐγράφοντο*. How this came to be replaced by the third plural form has not been satisfactorily explained (cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Simon Portius*, p. 198). I believe the substitution to be subsequent to, and consequent upon, the merging of third singular and third plural in the imperfect of the verb "to be," for which see below.

For the first and second singular one starts from *ἐγραφόμην* and *ἐγράφεσο* (cf. *γράφεσαι* above). Whence the endings *-μουν* and *-σουν*? The *ν* is an extension from the first and third to the second person. The prevailing opinion seems to be that the *ου* also originated in the first person by phonetic change of the unaccented vowel after *μ*, and was extended to the second person. So Meyer-Lübke, *Simon Portius*, p. 198, Hatzidakis, *Einleitung*, p. 61. But such a phonetic change is otherwise comparatively rare and locally restricted, and Hatzidakis, *Μεσαιωνικά*, II, 293, remarks that the ending *-μουν* is the only case in which it is at all general. This leads one to consider the possibility that *ου* arose first in the second singular *-σο* and was extended to the first. *ου* from *ο* (Hatzidakis, *Μεσαιωνικά*, II, 282 ff.) is more widespread than *ου* from *η* (*ι*, *υ*), and one might further think of influence from the side of the pronoun



The forms of the third singular and third plural imperfect go back to a third singular  $\eta\tau\omicron$ , which became  $\eta\tau\omicron\nu$  (cf. *IG*, XIV, 1890) with  $\nu$  added after the analogy of active forms, just as in  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\omicron\nu$ , etc. (above, p. 94). In mediaeval writings  $\eta\tau\omicron\nu$  is singular only, the plural being  $\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$  or  $\eta\sigma\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$ , e.g., in the Chronicle of Morea regularly, though  $\eta\tau\alpha\nu$  appears occasionally in the later MS P. This  $\eta\tau\alpha\nu$  was formed to the singular  $\eta\tau\omicron\nu$  after the other plurals in  $-\alpha\nu$ . In the seventeenth century the singular and plural were still differentiated. Simon Portius gives sing.  $\eta\tau\omicron\nu$ , pl.  $\eta\tau\alpha\nu$  or  $\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ , and Romanos gives sing.  $\eta\tau\omicron\nu$ , pl.  $\eta\tau\alpha\nu$ . But the fact that the two forms differed now only in the unstressed vowel, coupled with the identity of third singular and third plural in the present  $\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\iota$ , led to the promiscuous use of both forms as singular or plural. Finally this reacted on the inflection of the regular verbs (above, p. 94).

*Formation of the present stem.*—Of the numerous shifts and extensions the following may be noted here. All the old  $\mu\iota$ -verbs, except the verb

$\epsilon\sigma\acute{\upsilon}$  which in several dialects is  $\epsilon\sigma\omicron\acute{\upsilon}$ . Neither point of view, it is true, furnishes an adequate explanation, since the ending  $-\sigma\omicron\nu\nu$  is not dialectic, but the one in common use everywhere. But admitting that there is a phonetic difficulty with the  $\omicron\nu$ , whether one starts from the first or second person, there is ground for believing, in contrast to previous discussions, that the second person is the proper point of attack, as the one in which  $\omicron\nu$  has the priority. The form  $\eta\sigma\omicron\nu\nu$  of 403 A.D. (Migne, LXXIX, 544 B, quoted by Dieterich, *Untersuchungen*, p. 224) is far earlier than any example of  $-\mu\omicron\nu\nu$ . In the vulgar Greek poems of Prodomos we read:  $\epsilon\gamma\omega\ \eta\mu\eta\nu\ \delta\iota\omicron\lambda\eta\pi\tau\iota\kappa\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon\ \eta\sigma\omicron\nu\nu\ \mu\alpha\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma$  (Legrand, *Bibliothèque grecque vulgaire*, I, 40, l. 68), and constantly first person in  $-\mu\eta\nu$  in the texts, pp. 38–103. Only the text, pp. 102–24, from a MS which is full of later forms (cf. Psichari, *Essais* I, 121 ff.), substitutes  $\eta\mu\omicron\nu\nu$  or  $\eta\mu\omicron\nu\nu\epsilon$  for  $\eta\mu\eta\nu$  of the corresponding text from a better MS, pp. 101–6. Another poem believed to be of twelfth century redaction (Lambros, *Collection de romans grecs*, 289 ff.) has  $\eta\mu\eta\nu$ , l. 637 (and constantly), but  $\eta\sigma\omicron\nu\nu$ , l. 639. In the dialect of Carpathus the old ending  $-\mu\eta\nu$  is still preserved, but the second person ends in  $-\sigma\omicron\nu\nu$ . Thus, from Manolaki *Καρπαθιακά*,  $\eta\mu\eta\nu$  frequently (e.g., pp. 221, 228, 230, 242, 249, 253 [bis]; once, however,  $\eta\mu\omicron\nu\nu\alpha$ , p. 258, doubtless an encroachment of the common type),  $\kappa\omicron\iota\mu\omicron\upsilon\mu\eta(\nu)$ ,  $\pi\alpha\nu\delta\rho\epsilon\nu\mu\eta(\nu)$ , etc., but  $\eta\sigma\omicron\nu\nu$ , pp. 250, 252, 256.

In the first plural  $-\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$  became  $-\mu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$  after the analogy of the second plural  $-\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ ; or rather, since  $\sigma\theta$ , though commonly retained in the spelling, was pronounced  $\sigma\tau$ , became  $-\mu\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon$  after  $-\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon$ . This happened in present and imperfect alike, and at an early period. The form  $-\mu\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon$  which now prevails, though  $-\mu\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon$  is also heard, must have arisen first in the imperfect where it owes its  $\alpha$  to the influence of the third plural in  $-\alpha\nu$  or better to the collateral forms in  $-\alpha\nu\epsilon$  or  $-\alpha\sigma\iota$ , e.g.,  $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\phi\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon$  after  $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\phi\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon$  or  $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\phi\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$ ,  $\eta\mu\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon$  after  $\eta\tau\alpha\nu\epsilon$  or  $\eta\sigma\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$ . That is, such vowel leveling is most likely to occur where there is parallelism in the number of syllables of the ending. Note, for example, that in the chronicle of Morea we have  $-\mu\alpha\nu$  for  $-\mu\epsilon\nu$  in  $\epsilon\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\beta\eta\mu\alpha\nu$  beside third plural  $\epsilon\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\beta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ , similarly  $\epsilon\tau\acute{\rho}\alpha\pi\eta\mu\alpha\nu$ ,  $\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\rho}\alpha\phi\eta\mu\alpha\nu$ , etc., whenever the correspondence was  $-\eta\mu\epsilon\nu$ ,  $-\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ , but on the other hand  $\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu$  beside  $\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ , etc.

For the second plural the grammarians of the seventeenth century still give  $\eta\sigma\theta\epsilon$ ,  $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\phi\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ , or  $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\phi\omicron\sigma\theta\epsilon$ . Since then  $-\sigma\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon$  has come in beside  $-\mu\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon$ , after the analogy of the relation between  $-\mu\omicron\nu\nu$  and  $-\sigma\omicron\nu\nu$  in singular, i.e.,  $-\mu\omicron\nu\nu$  :  $-\sigma\omicron\nu\nu$  =  $-\mu\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon$  :  $-\sigma\alpha\sigma\tau\epsilon$ . Cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Simon Portius*, p. 199.



"to be" (and even here no active  $\mu$ - form is preserved), have passed over into one of the thematic types or been replaced by unrelated words. Thus we have θέτω for τίθημι, δίνω or διδω for δίδωμι, ἐμπορῶ for δύναιμι, etc.

Presents in -νω have spread very extensively at the expense of various others. Thus φέρνω "bring" (φέρω), δένω "bind" (δέω), χίνω "pour" (χέω), ἀφήνω "leave" (ἀφίημι), etc.; so regularly -ώνω for -όω or -ώννυμι, as σκοτώνω "slay" (σκοτώω "darken"), διορθώνω "mend," πληρώνω "pay" (πληρόω "fill"), στρώνω "spread" (στρώννυμι), ζώνω "gird" (ζώννυμι), etc. In all these last and many of the others -νω is added to the form of the verb-stem which appears in the aorist; that is, they are formed anew from the aorist, e.g., σκοτώνω from ἐσκότωσα, ἀφήνω from ἄφησα. Presents in -αίνω have been augmented by numerous new formations, many of these also based upon the aorist stem. Thus λαμβάνω is replaced by λαβαίνω (καταλαβαίνω "understand"), formed from the aorist ἔλαβα (ἔλαβον), and similarly λανθάνω, μανθάνω, τυγχάνω by λαθαίνω, μαθαίνω, τυχαίνω, and πάσχω (aor. ἔπαθον) by παθαίνω. Cf. πηγαίνω "go" formed to ὑπῆγα, which is in origin the imperfect of ὑπάγω but had come to be used as an aorist.

CARL D. BUCK

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

*Arte e Artificio nel Dramma Greco.* A FRANCESCO GUGLIELMINO.  
Catania: Francesco Battiato, 1912. Pp. xii+301. L. 4.

The title indicates the author's point of view and the chief defect of a well-written book, intended for the general reader rather than for the professional scholar. It is a study, from that point of view, of the technique of Greek tragedy. It is in two parts, the first on the conventions of Greek dramatic art and the devices for preserving verisimilitude under those requirements, the second on the ways in which plays are shaped by the desire for immediate effect. Another volume is promised, which is to follow the subject of the second part farther, and thence proceed to consider other aspects of the drama more or less related.

The point of view seems natural, perhaps; the defect of it may not appear at first. Yet the result is unfortunate precisely for the reader who is not technically a scholar. Unless he can make the needed corrections, he may carry away, instead of a true picture of a great art that differs from ours, a picture subtly distorted, and this will tend to confirm some popular prejudices that are due simply to lack of knowledge. The author of course intended no such result; it is merely inseparable from the method of distinguishing an art-form from the details that make up that form, and calling the whole form art and essential components artifices.

Take what is said of the convention that the chorus almost always remains on the scene. We see it from a wrong side unless we take the point

of view of the Athenian audience. They, regarding the chorus as central and vital—still, in a sense, as from the beginning, the chorus of Dionysos dancing and singing to the god in his precinct—were accustomed to the convention, and maintained it. They never fancied that verisimilitude required the chorus to enter the palace, and never regarded the excuse for remaining as an artifice. τὸ πρέπον, if not τὸ εἰκός, forbade the chorus to withdraw. Tacitly to impose our alien convention on the Athenian dramatist is to mislead rather than to explain. So with some of the appeals to immediate effect. It is unfair to the dramatist and his art to forget that he and his audience were all Athenians together. Was it flattering his audience, a seeking for effect, when Lowell in his *Commemoration Ode* said what his audience felt so deeply in praise of the reunited country for which, in the Civil War just ended, those graduates had died? When the Athenian dramatist, sharing the Athenian pride in their country's history or legend, makes a character express a common patriotic emotion or belief, we cannot properly call that flattery of the audience, or an artifice for effect, even though the words were sure to call out rapturous applause. The bit of truth in such a view is so partial as to be false. In regard to the *Persians*, again, Guglielmino falls into a similar, though common, mistake. The historical element in the play, if by that term we mean strictly historical details, is very small, hardly more than a few names and the account of the battle of Salamis. The historical events could not be made into the plot of an Athenian tragedy without thorough recasting. They were recalled vividly, so as to awaken the patriotic pride of the audience, by those names and the story of that central event, the recent battle. But *these* Persians are really a creation of the poet's imagination—Aischylean-Oriental Greeks, foreign enough to be very ignorant of Athens, but deeply imbued with the poet's own religion and morality. Questions of historical verisimilitude are here out of place. It was the author's title, the form in which he chose to cast his exposition, that drew him, in these and many other details, to look at things from an unfortunate angle. If he had set out to write a straightforward *Grammar of Athenian Dramatic Art* probably most of these matters would have fallen into their true relations.

With this important subtraction, the book is interesting and mostly sound, more readable perhaps in the first part than in the second. Occasionally one must dissent from a reading of a character. One can hardly grant, e.g., that Sophokles, in the *Aias*, has really exhibited the goddess of his own city as on a lower moral plane than Odysseus (pp. 72 f.). The author follows G. Dopheide in finding not a few inconsistencies in tragedies of Sophokles due to the poet's aiming at some immediate effect; but the two cases cited (pp. 102, 171) reveal no discrepancy. On the other hand Guglielmino is nearer the truth than most in his understanding of fate in Sophokles (p. 210, note). He shows no trace of acquaintance with anything printed in the United States. And it is odd to see a paper in the *Classical Review*

by Professor Macurdy (Grace Harriet) credited to "I'Harriet" (p. 62). But we can afford to be amused rather than irritated at such things, and may remind ourselves that many of us in this country do not keep up with Italian publications as we should.

THOMAS D. GOODELL

YALE UNIVERSITY

*Die Spürhunde des Sophokles.* Von U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLEN-DORFF. Sonderabdruck aus dem XXIX. Bande der neuen Jahrbücher für das Klassische Alterthum. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 1.

Professor von Wilamowitz assisted Hunt in the construction of the text of the new fragments of Sophocles, and, after waiting for Hunt to publish, now gives to the public his own interpretations.

The tragic fragments he holds to be undoubtedly Sophoclean and refers them to a tragedy *Eurypylos* already divined by Tyrwhitt. The long fragment descriptive of Priam's lament for Eurypylos he quotes and interprets with observations on the style which are much needed to reconcile us to the Sophoclean authorship of some of these lines. When, for instance, Priam seems to speak of the dead Eurypylos as τὸν παῖδα τὸν γέροντα τὸν νεανίαν, it is surely reading a great deal into γέροντα to interpret it by Aeschylus' γέροντα τὸν νοῦν σάρκα δ' ἡβῶσαν φέρει. The third line νεκρῷ διδόντες οὐδὲν ὠφελουμένῃ he rejects as tasteless and obviously spurious. But may it not be defended by *Iliad* xxii. 513: οὐδὲν σοί γ' ὄφελος? In the last four lines

χρόνον ξενωθείς οὐ μακρὸν πολλῶν [δ' ἐτῶν]  
μνήμην παρέξεις τοῖς [λελειμμέν]οις [δορός]  
ὅς' οὔτε Μένων οὔτε Σαρπηδῶν ποτε]  
π[έν]θη π[ο]σῆς κ[αί]περ αἰχμ[η]τῶν ἄκροι]

I would suggest that we place a comma after παρέξεις and construe the following dative with π[έν]θη π[ο]σῆς, for which, if space allows, it would perhaps be better to substitute πένθη παρασχών (Aeschyl. *Persae* 322, Σάρδεις|πένθος παρασχών), reading also, perhaps, οὔτε for καίπερ.

The *Ἰχνηταὶ Σάτυροι*, of which some four hundred lines have been rescued, deals with the theme of the Homeric Hymn to Hermes. Wilamowitz plausibly reconstructs the plot and quotes and interprets the chorus' quest for the cattle and Cylene's teasing speech. From the style he infers that the play belongs to the earlier period of Sophocles' *πικρὸν καὶ κατὰ τεχνον* manner. He confirms this conclusion by the absence of three speakers and of ἀντιλαβή, and the suggestion that Sophocles himself may have played the part of Hermes which he would hardly have done except as a youth.

The fact that the *ἰχνευταί* are most naturally conceived as a pack of hounds, and Silenos, who is not explicitly named, as their hunt-master, leads to an interesting discussion of the whole vexed question of Satyrs and Silens on the Athenian stage, which there is no space to summarize. I am pleased to see that in Aeschylus fr. 207: *τράγος γένειον ἄρα πενήθσεις σύ γε*, Professor von Wilamowitz agrees that the nominative cannot be taken as vocative. But he tries to "save his goat" by assimilating the construction to that of Sophocles fr. 182: *ἐρινὸς ἄλλους ἐξερινάζεις λόγῳ*. The text of this is doubtful. But even if we accept Wilamowitz' text, surely the point of the line lies in the etymologizing pun and teasing repetition of *ἐρινός* in *ἐξερινάζεις*. There is nothing of this in *τράγος γένειον*, which, as I tried to show in *Class. Phil.*, IV, 433, belongs grammatically and idiomatically in the category of *rusticus exspectat* and *κύων ἐπέρησα χαράδρην*.

The latter part of the essay gives Wilamowitz' present views of the origin of the Greek drama. The vaticinations of the English folklorist school are rejected *in toto* (p. 24): "*petitio principii* und schillernde Möglichkeiten sind üble Surrogate des Beweises." He insists particularly upon their hopeless confusion of conjectural prehistoric religion in any part of the world with the actual development of the drama in Attica. It is this last which we wish to know; and it is this which we must presume Aristotle to have known even when he neglects to tell us the details. There remains the difficulty of transition from the *λέξις γελοῖα* and saltatory trochaic tetrameter of "satyric" tragedy to Aeschylus' mighty line. Wilamowitz cuts rather than unties the knot by the personal genius of Aeschylus and an eloquent appeal to the mutation theory of evolution in botany and the Carlyleian gospel of the great man in history. The footnotes throughout this pregnant and suggestive paper teem with ideas which no student of the Greek drama can afford to overlook.

PAUL SHOREY

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*Der Orient und die frühgriechische Kunst.* VON FREDERIK POULSEN.

Leipzig: Teubner, 1912. Pp. vi+195, with 196 illustrations in the text. M. 12.

Poulsen's purpose in this book, as he himself states it (p. 3), is to show "how the Greek orientalizing style came into being." His method is to analyze carefully a large number of works of the ninth, eighth, and seventh centuries B.C., especially works of minor art, and by this means to attempt to determine the elements of the orientalizing style and to trace them back to their origin in Egyptian, Assyrian, Hittite, and Phoenician art.

Such a book is impossible to criticize in detail in the brief limits of a review. The validity of the argument depends, in almost every case, on

the cumulative force of a mass of evidence, and this can be seen only by reading the book itself. Every reader can select single statements and arguments that do not seem to him so significant as the author would have us believe, but a long list of such points, taken out of their connection, would not really affect the validity of the argument as a whole. Under these circumstances, the best that a reviewer can do is to state the conclusions and the tendencies of the book and hope thus to inspire others to investigate the arguments for themselves. This the present reviewer is the more inclined to do, because he finds himself so closely in agreement with many of the views advanced.

In general, Poulsen's attitude toward the question of the origin of the orientalizing style may be characterized as eclectic. He holds, clearly, that the problem is more complex than it has been thought to be by many critics. The *Panionismus* which has had so much vogue in recent years has no charms for him, and he is especially severe in his strictures on the *Pankretismus* of Loewy's recent attempt to trace practically all the orientalizing motives of early Greek art back to Crete (cf. *Jahresh. oest. Inst.*, XII [1910], 243-304, and XIV [1912], 1-34). He does not deny the importance of Ionic and Cretan influence, but he does deny that Ionia or Crete was the exclusive (or even the most important) intermediary between the east and the west. The important intermediaries he finds rather in Cyprus and Rhodes, above all in Phoenicia. Indeed, the most striking feature of the book is the very successful attempt which Poulsen makes to rehabilitate the Phoenicians, whose importance it has been the fashion in recent years to minimize. The earlier chapters are devoted to a careful and illuminating analysis of the famous bronze bowls from Nimrud; the bronze and silver bowls from Cyprus, Crete, the Greek mainland, and Italy; the carved ivories from Nimrud and elsewhere; the so-called *tridacna* shells from different sites; and various other objects that have been brought into connection with Phoenician art. Poulsen argues convincingly for the Phoenician origin of most of these objects, and uses them constantly in the later chapters to prove Phoenician influence in works found in Greece and Italy.

The titles of the later chapters and their conclusions are as follows: chap. vi, "The Cretan Shields" (these are close copies by Cretan workmen of Phoenician shields, showing almost no originality); vii, "Early Rhodian Art" (it was strongly influenced by Phoenician products, but here we see the earliest manifestation of the Greek spirit, transforming the oriental models); viii, "The Ivory Figures from the Artemisium at Ephesus" (they show little direct Phoenician influence; they were affected rather by Rhodian prototypes and by the art of Asia Minor, which was largely under the influence of Hittite art); ix, "Oriental Elements in Greek Geometric Art" (such elements are rare; they were drawn from Phoenician, Cypriote, Cretan, and Ionic sources); x, "Finds in Italy" (here there was little direct imitation of Phoenician works; the earlier orientalizing products exhibit

principally oriental forms as they were developed in Cyprus, the later show a preponderance of Rhodian and Ionic influence); xi, "The Figures with the *Etagenperücke*" (these figures, in which the hair appears as a wiglike mass in horizontal layers, represent a mode of wearing the hair which was introduced into Greece from Phoenicia toward the end of the eighth century B.C., probably through the mediation of Rhodes); xii, "The Significance of Early Cretan Art (Cretan art in the Dark Ages is Byzantine in character, i.e., an art which long preserved the traditions of an earlier and more splendid development, and which only rose to new importance when quickened by contact with the fresher, more living art of Ionia); xiii, "The Monuments and the Homeric Poems" (Helbig was more nearly right than Reichel and Drerup in turning to the monuments of the Dark Ages rather than to those of the Mycenaean Age for the study of Homeric *Realien*; in the poems, Phoenician influence is paramount in matters of art, and the monuments described show closer analogies to post-Mycenaean than to Mycenaean works; Homeric armor and Homeric dress, also, are best illustrated by the monuments of the post-Mycenaean period; the poems had their origin in some region of Asia Minor where oriental influence was strong).

Such a brief summary may suggest the wide range of Poulsen's investigations. It gives no idea of the wide knowledge and the keen observation that he everywhere displays. One is somewhat surprised to find no reference in the final chapter to Lang's theory of the "moment of culture," even if it were only introduced to be denied all probability. But such omissions are rare. In general, Poulsen's knowledge of recent literature seems no less comprehensive than his knowledge of the monuments.

For the archaeologist the principal value of this work will be found in the lists of monuments and the proposed criteria for distinguishing the products of different centers. The philologist will probably find the last chapter the most interesting. But the book deserves the serious attention of all who are interested in the fascinating problem of the origin of Greek civilization.

GEORGE H. CHASE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

---

*Apollonius Rhodius: The Argonautica.* With an English Translation by R. C. SEATON, M.A. "Loeb Classical Library." New York: Macmillan, 1912. \$1.50.

Mr. Seaton has rendered the *Argonautica* into English prose that reproduces very closely the movement of the original. In point of diction he strikes a happy mean; the reader's attention is not arrested by obtrusive archaic forms, nor yet is the language wanting in dignity and elevation. The translation moves rapidly and carries the reader along easily. While it is closely made it has freedom as well, and shows on every page the art of



fusing mere words into a true English equivalent. The new translation is admirably suited to its purpose of winning readers for Apollonius.

Turning our attention to the left-hand page of the new volume we find a revision of the Oxford text of 1900. The changes in the Greek text are not many, but they show care and judgment. The proper name, Ἐπιβώτης, wherever it occurs, e. g., i. 71, appears in its correct form, not as Ἐρυβώτης, a case where the inferior MS tradition kept something of value. In i. 103, κείνην is accepted instead of κοινήν, a case where the better MS tradition shows the lesser degree of corruption. There is a goodly array of readings that have been set in the text itself, instead of remaining among the probabilities or possibilities of the critical notes: i. 372, 811, 1099, 1187, 1216; ii. 274, and still others. One change that is in the direction of conservatism seems open to doubt. In iv. 336 the ἀκράς of the inferior tradition is shielded by the corrupt ἀπράς of Codex Laurentianus, a reading which implies ἀκράς. Schneider's view that the corruption is at the end of the verse seems more probable. His text also makes this passage agree better with 514-16 where the Colchians are mentioned as establishing themselves on the mainland.

A few details of textual correctness deserve attention. Since Apollonius regularly lengthens before a mute and liquid it is better to follow L in omitting ν movable in iv. 986, 1496. In iii. 970 L has ἰπὸ ῥιπῆς, not ἰπαι. In ii. 1229 the text should be corrected accordingly. A parallel correction is actually made in iv. 1735. Why not follow Brunck in extending the principle to iv. 1159, 1613? In iv. 723 all MSS have ἰδρύθησαν, not ἰδρύνθησαν, and on the point involved L supports this form in iv. 532, although not in iii. 1269. The form without ν is found in the better MSS of Theocritus xiii. 28, and in a papyrus text of the *Iliad*, iii. 78. I once made a plea, on the score of epic usage, for the form Περσεφόνη, as against Φερσεφόνη of the MSS in ii. 916 (*Proc. Am. Phil. Assn.*, XXXIII, lx). The correct form of this word, so far as concerns the various types of poetry, has since then been discussed by Keil, *Hermes*, XLIII, 536-37, without any reference however to the passage in Apollonius. The facts as Keil exhibits them leave us two alternatives: either Apollonius believed that a form beginning with Φ was Homeric, having such a type of Homeric text in mind as is represented by the corrections to Ven. A of the *Iliad*, ix. 457; or, our MS tradition of Apollonius has been corrupted by the current Hellenistic form. The latter alternative still seems to me more probable.

As regards the translation: iii. 290 and 1131 are so much alike that one wonders why θυμὸν of the former passage should not be emended to θυμός. iii. 117, "playing for golden dice," not "with," is almost convincing. But it puts an unusual strain upon the verb, as if it were a verb of striving. iii. 1060, τοῖό γ' ἔκχηται is rendered "thereupon." While this is a faint rendering of the Greek, one cannot question its correctness. I hesitate to accept Way's spirited "if this be all," because τοῖο would then refer to κῶας, which seems harsh. In iv. 741, the aorist infinitive is capable of its ordinary mean-



ing and need not be taken as a future. A parallel case, iv. 15, *ληθόμεν* is correctly rendered as a present rather than a future. A vexed passage, iv. 1487-88, is briefly treated in a footnote. The following is offered as a different approach to the difficulty. (1) The clause introduced by *τόφρα* is final, as in iii. 807. (2) *ἔων μῆλων περί* is a Homeric reminiscence (*Od.* xi. 403) and relates to an aggressor, striving for a piece of plunder. Therefore this prepositional phrase does not go with *ἀλεξόμενος*. (3) The word-order is important: between the subject of the verb and the verb itself are inserted the object, Canthus, the fight which he makes, and the purpose of the fight; then come further particulars about the subject. The difficulty, then, lies in the absence of a participle like the Homeric *μαχεούμενον* which is needed to help out the prepositional phrase. It is at least conceivable that Apollonius wrote the sentence as it stands and left the prepositional phrase "in the matter of his sheep" unsupported by a participle: "who in defending himself slew you with the cast of a stone, you who strove for his sheep that you might bring them to your needy comrades." In any case, the first part of Merkel's critical note seems to me the more valuable part, where he agrees with Schneider in removing the prepositional phrase from the nominative participle.

There are many difficult places where Mr. Seaton's translation shows how he deals with disputed points. It would lead one too far afield to pass these in review. Suffice it to say that the translation as a whole is a most welcome interpretation of the *Argonautica*.

EDWARD FITCH

HAMILTON COLLEGE

---

*Kleine Schriften, mit einem Bildniss und zwei Tafeln.* VON ALBRECHT DIETERICH. Leipzig: Teubner, 1911. M. 14.

After Albrecht Dieterich's death in the summer semester of 1908 many of his friends and associates expressed the hope that the more important of his scattered articles might be brought together and reprinted in available form. The work was undertaken by Richard Wünsch, Dieterich's successor in the conduct of the *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, who has given us a stout volume as a memorial of his friend. None of Dieterich's larger works—*Abraxas* (1891), *Nekyia* (1893), *Die Grabschrift des Aberkios* (1896), *Pulcinella* (1897), *Eine Mithrasliturgie* (1903, 1910<sup>2</sup>), and *Mutter Erde* (1905)—is here included, and of his numerous contributions to the *Realencyclopädie* only the "Aischylos" and the "Euripides" are reprinted, but the thirty numbers given display abundantly the interests, enthusiasm, and scholarship of their author. In date these papers range from that of the opening article, "Papyrus Magica, Prolegomena," which Dieterich developed from his doctoral dissertation and published in the *Jahrbücher für Klassische Philologie*, Suppl. Bd. XVI (1888), pp. 749 ff., to the last two articles, "Der Ritus der

verhüllten Hände" and "Der Untergang der antiken Religion," which are here printed for the first time. Although most of these papers naturally deal with ancient religion and folk-lore, yet no less than seven—"De Hymnis Orphicis," "Die Zahl der Dramen des Aischylos," "Über eine Szene der aristophanischen Wolken," "Aischylos," "Die Widmungslegie des letzten Buches des Properz," "Euripides," and "Die Entstehung der Tragödie"—are concerned with literary matters; and one is that warm appreciation of Hermann Usener's services to the study of religion which Dieterich published in the *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* soon after his master's death in 1905. Whether it was wise to reprint all that is here included is an ungracious question, but one that may well be raised, especially with reference to such a selection as VIII, "Über den Ursprung des Sarapis," which is a mere summary of an address delivered before the forty-fourth annual meeting of German philologists and teachers in Dresden in 1897. A number of other papers also originated as addresses and have kept the character and style of the spoken word. If their author could have prepared such for reprinting, he doubtless would have added many notes to show the bases of his statements and to make clearer his attitude toward the results of his fellow-workers in the same field. Wünsch has done something to supply this lack, but the majority of the notes that are not drawn from material left by Dieterich refer to Dieterich's own work. In the case of a philologist of the very first rank there is often good reason for republishing his writings in the form in which they originally appeared; but Dieterich, in spite of his stimulating enthusiasm, his knowledge and insight, had hardly attained to the highest position when he was prematurely cut down; furthermore, it was characteristic of the man that his writings more often present suggestions and new points of view than offer complete treatment of his themes, carefully worked out in detail and supported by all the evidence. To recognize this fact is not to belittle Dieterich's work. Insight and the power to inspire others are rarer than the ability to work through in painstaking and plodding fashion a set task; and Dieterich showed in his earliest publications that he could employ all the arts of the minute and painstaking philologist and present a documented treatment with the best.

It is unnecessary here to sit again in judgment on the greater part of the book, for scholars have already given their praise or registered their dissent as the several articles have appeared. It will be better to speak briefly of the last two articles which are now printed for the first time, "Der Ritus der verhüllten Hände" and "Der Untergang der antiken Religion." The former has as its starting-point a fragmentary statue in the Capitoline Museum (Helbig, I<sup>1</sup>, 405) which represents a person carrying a vase in covered hands, as if to protect the sacred object from profane touch; with this statue Dieterich compares a long series of Christian monuments, beginning with the fourth century and running down to the early Renaissance, in which persons are represented as receiving, offering, or holding with covered hands some

sacred object, e. g., the roll of the New Law, the martyr's crown, the keys of heaven, etc. Furthermore, this custom has lasted down to the present day in the ritual of the Catholic church, for the priest's hands are sometimes covered with a cloth before the elevation of the Host, monks on approaching the altar often conceal their hands in their robes, and a cardinal receives his hat from the Pope with covered hands. A similar practice was introduced by Diocletian into his court ceremonial and was continued at Byzantium, as stated by Constantinus Porphyrogenetus (*De caerimoniis aulae Byzantinae*, II, 21 and 28, Bonn). But the practice is much older, as literary and monumental evidence shows. Dieterich comes to the conclusion that the custom, originally Persian, was made known to the West by the campaigns of Alexander the Great, was taken into the ritual of Isis, as is seen in the well-known relief in the Palazzo Mattei, and gradually spread over the Roman world. Wunsch notes, however, that the custom was also native to the Roman worship of Fides. In spite of the fact that the last part of this study was not found among Dieterich's manuscripts and had to be reprinted from the summary in the report of the Second International Congress for the History of Religion held at Basle in 1905, the study is one of the best in the volume. It illustrates Dieterich's habit of looking at all questions from the historical point of view, without which he rightly held all attempts at interpretation are futile, and in spite of its incompleteness, it likewise shows how illuminating such studies may be made.

The final article, "Der Untergang der antiken Religion," deals with a subject which Dieterich treated several times in university and public lectures. The introduction and the first part are reproduced verbatim from his manuscript; Parts II-V had to be reconstructed from the notebooks of his pupils. But even so it is well that the paper has been reprinted, for, in spite of the summary form in which it inevitably now appears, it represents in outline Dieterich's views on the subject with which he was most occupied. His conception of his problem is best stated in his own words: "Den Untergang einer Religion darzustellen heisst in Wirklichkeit nichts anderes als die Geschichte dieser Religion darzustellen." That is, he conceived of religion as a living thing, which like every organism has from its birth the elements of decay as well as of growth within itself, and which is subject to modification by its environment. He divided his theme into five chapters: (i) "Die Revolution von oben"; (ii) "Die Revolution von unten"; (iii) "Die Revolution von aussen"; (iv) "Die religiöse Erregung der Massen"; and (v) "Der Kampf zwischen der antiken Religion und dem Christentum. Die letzten Kompromisse." The course of his thought is somewhat as follows. The commonly accepted beliefs and practices of the Greeks were threatened from above by the development of rationalism and skepticism among the educated classes. The whole course of philosophic thinking from Xenophanes on meant disaster to the older views. No less fatal was the use of allegory to which many resorted, notably the Stoics, in their attempts to square their

positions with the common beliefs. While these influences were operating from above, a faith in immortality and a longing after a happy life beyond the grave, which found their expression in the religion of Dionysus and in the various mysteries, made their way upward from the lower classes of society. These two elements Dieterich regards as the chief factors in the destruction of genuine Greek religion. From without the classic world came, in the Alexandrian and Roman periods, many gods, Isis and Osiris, the Baalim and their consorts, the Great Mother and Attis, Mithras, and the rest, whose religions likewise made life after death the chief concern of man. The syncretism of the day also threatened the old polytheism almost as much as did the monotheistic tendencies of philosophers. In longing for relief from their present distress and for assurance of future happiness, the masses turned feverishly to every new means offered; the resort to magic and to all kinds of superstition was common in every class of society from the lowest to the emperors themselves. The hope of a savior, of some man who would restore peace and happiness among men, was widespread.

Christianity was made known to the Hellenistic world by Paul, and first came into conflict with paganism at Rome; it soon made its way into the higher classes of society and did not suffer a systematic persecution until that of Decius in 250 A.D. The history of the hundred years from the end of the third century to the close of the fourth exhibits three phases of the struggle which are connected with three emperors, Diocletian, Constantine, and Julian. Under the first of these an attempt was made to uproot Christianity absolutely, but this was an impossible task, so well established was the Christian sect; under Constantine, Christianity gained the freedom enjoyed by other religions; and after Julian's gallant effort to regenerate paganism as a solar monotheism was cut short by his death, Christianity was left victorious. By the end of the century it had obtained its definite triumph under Theodosius. The pagan temples were closed or destroyed, yet the victory of Christianity was accompanied by many compromises which brought into the triumphant religion much from the old. To quote Dieterich's words again: "Solange ein Volk lebt, sind seine Götter unsterblich. Der alte Polytheismus sass tief in den Seelen der Menschen und war nicht ohne einen Vernichtungskampf, den man scheute, auszurotten. Aber er besass auch die Fähigkeit, sich in neue Formen zu fügen. . . . So ist denn der Untergang der antiken Religion zugleich die Genesis des Christentums, unserer eigenen Religion geworden, und dadurch, dass das Christentum Teile des Alten in sich aufgenommen hat, ist auch auf diesem Gebiet unsere Zeit die Erbin der Antike geworden."

There are many questions and objections which rise to one's mind as he reads this final article. For example, we should like to know what Dieterich meant by "genuine Greek religion." Hardly the religion seen in the Homeric poems, although he seems at one time to imply this. Again we would ask if it is necessarily true that the mysteries had their origin in the worship

of Hades and gods of the lower world alone; and we should like to hear what were the reasons for the victory of Christianity. On this last point Dieterich does not touch. But after all it would be ungracious to raise such questions, considering the conditions under which this article was printed. It is a more just and agreeable thing to express appreciation of the historical grasp and insight which the paper displays. They were indeed fortunate who heard the lectures and could enjoy Dieterich's persuasive enthusiasm.

The volume has as frontispiece an excellent portrait of Dieterich in his library, and as introduction Wunsch has reprinted with slight changes his biographical notice which first appeared in the *Jahresbericht* for 1910.

CLIFFORD H. MOORE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

---

RECENT LOEB LIBRARY VOLUMES

*Cicero, Letters to Atticus.* With an English Translation by E. O. WINSTEDT, M.A., in three volumes. Vols. I and II. Pp. ix+496 and xi+439.

*Catullus, Tibullus, and Pervigilium Veneris.* With Translations by FRANCIS WARRE CORNISH, M.A., J. P. POSTGATE and J. W. MACKAIL. Pp. xi+376.

*The Greek Bucolic Poets.* With an English Translation by J. M. EDMONDS. Pp. xxviii+527. New York: Macmillan, 1912-13.

Mr. Winstedt's translation presents the correspondence of Cicero up to September, 47, when the orator is at Brundisium, awaiting his fate at Caesar's hands. Nothing could be more clear, straightforward, and easy than the English of this rendering; it may be read almost without consciousness of the fact that it is translation. If there is ground at all for dissatisfaction, it is that the fulness of Ciceronian thought and the sweep of the Ciceronian phrase have been somewhat sacrificed to the ideal of English style—the latter, of course, inevitably—and that Mr. Winstedt's rendering lacks the variety of Cicero. The following passage will illustrate the character of his translation:

O suaves epistulas tuas uno tempore mihi datas duas! Quibus εὐαγγέλια quae reddam, nescio; deberi quidem plane fateor. Sed vide συγκύρημα. Emer-seram commodum ex Antiati in Appiam ad Tris Tabernas ipsis Cerealibus, cum in me incurrat Roma veniens Curio meus. Ibidem ilico puer abs te cum epistulis. Ille ex me, nihilne audissem novi. Ego negare. "Publius," inquit, "tribunatum pl. petit." "Quid ais?"—

Fancy two such delightful letters of yours being delivered at one and the same time! I don't know how to pay you back for your good news, though I candidly

confess my debt. Here's a coincidence. I had just taken the turn off the road to Antium on to the Appian Way at the Three Taverns on the very day of the Cerealia, when my friend Curio met me, fresh from Rome: and at the very same moment your man with a letter. Curio inquired whether I hadn't heard the news. "No," said I. "Publius is standing for the tribuneship," says he. "You don't say so!"

Mr. Cornish deserves the sympathy of all men, as well as the thanks of those who may have wanted to see Catullus in unmetrical English. No more difficult service could possibly be assigned a translator. Most of the poems which have given Catullus his fame are almost, if not quite, trivial when dissolved into prose; and the case is all the worse because a content of that character hardly warrants rhythmical prose. The accuracy of interpretation and precision of rendering which are Mr. Cornish's virtues are employed on poems like these little to either their or his own advantage. In the poems whose excellence depends less upon form, one feels, in the otherwise faultless rendering, a slight lack of poetic flavor, and would like a little more rhythm in the language:

Nec meum respectet, ut ante, amorem,  
qui illius culpa cecidit velut prati  
ultimi flos, praeter eunte postquam  
tactus aratros.—

And let her not look to find my love, as before; my love, which by her fault has dropped, like a flower on the meadow's edge, when it has been touched by the plough passing by.

Mr. Postgate is more fortunate in his author. In Tibullus there is uniformity in both matter and form, and the entire content admits of rhythmical English and poetic color. Mr. Postgate's English is a delight. It exemplifies in high degree the virtues of the British ideal of style; it is full of nerve and sinew, firm, and trained down—to use an athletic phrase. If it has any fault, it is that of too much training down. In the effort to avoid too much suppleness and grace, it approaches hardness and rigidity. In the translation of Tibullus, as in Mr. Winstedt's Cicero, rhythm and fullness are sometimes sacrificed to brevity and conciseness. Is "a small skiff plied across the shallows" enough for

ire solebat  
exiguus pulsa per vada linter aqua?

and does the character of content and sound in

nunc levis est tractanda venus, dum frangere postes  
non pudet et rixas inseruisse iuvat

justify, in the midst of a smooth-flowing passage, so harsh and prosaic a sentence as "Now let gay love be my pursuit when it is no shame to break a door down or to plunge into a brawl"?



But these things are at most slight cause for dissatisfaction. Mr. Postgate's rendering of this most charming singer of a charming land is seen to advantage in the following:

Agricola adsiduo primum satius aratro  
cantavit certo rustica verba pede,  
et satur arenti primum est modulatus avena  
carmen, ut ornatos diceret ante deos;  
agricola et minio suffusus, Bacche, rubenti  
primus in experta duxit ab arte choros.—

Then first the countryman, sated with ploughing without cease, sang rustic words in time and tune; and, full of meat, first composed a song on the dry oat-pipes to chaunt before the gods that his hands had dressed. And, Bacchus, it was a countryman that first dyed his skin with red vermilion and wound through the dance with unpractised art.

The *Pervigilium Veneris* masquerades in Mr. Mackail's translation as *The Eve of St. Venus*. The title is a success in so far as its romanticism accords with the romantic quality of the poem; but there is confusion in its suggestion of Christianity. The untranslatable first line, too, is still untranslated, in spite of Mr. Mackail's valiant effort. *Cras amet qui numquam amavit quique amavit cras amet* is perfectly clear, and "To-morrow shall be love for the loveless, and for the lover to-morrow shall be love" is full of ambiguities. Too bad; for it reproduces admirably the Latin order and the Latin vowel and consonantal repetition, if not the Latin rhythm and sonorosity. For the rest, the translation brings out beautifully the wealth of warm color and sparkling light and rustling verdure and musical notes and human passion that make the poem almost a riot of the imagination:

Cras amorum copulatrix inter umbras arborum  
implicat casas virentes de flagello myrteo:  
cras canoris feriatos ducit in silvis choros;  
cras Dione iura dicit fulta sublimi throno.  
cras amet qui numquam amavit quique amavit cras amet.—

To-morrow the marriage-maker of the loves amid shadows of trees weaves her verdurous bowers of myrtle-spray; to-morrow she leads her bands on festival in the singing forests: to-morrow Dione declares her laws high enthroned aloft.

To-morrow shall be love for the loveless, and for the lover to-morrow shall be love.

The translation has the same elusive character as the original; the reader hardly understands, and really doesn't care to understand, perfectly. The *Pervigilium* is like one of those songs or poems we know and use all our lives without really understanding all they mean, content with the charm of rhythm and the stirrings of the spirit which are all the more effective because never quite defined.

Mr. Edmonds, in his translation of the Greek bucolic poets, may be said to have been very successful in his aim: "to translate not so much the words



as their meaning, to observe not merely the obvious English idioms of syntax, but the more evasive but equally important ones of stress, word-order, and balance, and to create an atmosphere of association in some sense akin to the atmosphere of the original." The songs of the shepherd he throws into English ballad-meter, and for the main body of the poem uses archaic prose. If the archaisms are rather frequent and sometimes too unfamiliar, and the ballad-meter sometimes a trifle heavy and strained, and this impression somewhat deepened by the unavoidable heavy page, it is not to say that we have not here a charming Theocritus, Bion, and Moschus:

Now for that cup a ferryman of Calymnus had a goat and a gallant great cheese-loaf of me, and never yet hath it touched my lip; it still lies unhanselled by. Yet right welcome to it art thou, if like a good fellow thou'lt sing me that pleasing and delightful song. Nay, not so; I am in right earnest. To't, good friend; sure thou wilt not be hoarding that song against thou be'st come where all's forgot?

THYRSIS (*sings*)

*Country-song, sing country-song, sweet Muses.*

'Tis Thyrsis sings, of Etna, and a rare sweet voice hath he.  
Where were ye, Nymphs, when Daphnis pined? ye Nymphs, O where were ye?  
Was it Peneius' pretty vale, or Pindus' glens? 'twas never  
Anápus' flood nor Etna's pike nor Acis' holy river.

We feel like saying a word in appreciation of the translator's work. Not that the translators of these volumes need an apologist, for their work has been beautifully done; but because the reader will enjoy both original and translation more if he has due comprehension of the difficulties of the translator's task. The average mind probably conceives of translation as more or less mechanical, or, at least, immeasurably below creation. As a matter of fact, translation is a fine art, and requires no mean degree of inspiration.

What is a good translation? Not a difficult question to answer; nearly everyone will agree that there are two factors—one, good English; the other, faithful rendering.

And perhaps there will be as little difficulty in agreeing that good English means intelligible, grammatical, appropriate language which displays no offensive structural mark of its origin, and which, whether in dialect, pure idiom, or in archaic or poetic idiom, would easily be understood without reference to the words which it translates.

But what is meant by faithful rendering? The innocent term covers a multitude of requirements. We want, first, all the thought of all the original—all its intellectual content to the slightest shade of meaning. We want more; we want all the emotional content—humor, the passions, intensity. We want not only content, but form. We want verse translation of verse, or, at least, rhythmical prose. We want in translation

as much as possible of the style of the prose original. Whether it has the swing and rhythm of Cicero, or the studied abruptness of Tacitus, or the kaleidoscopic variety of Apuleius, we want some suggestion of these qualities in the translation. If possible, we want the thought of the original in the order of its thinking by the ancient author, and that means more or less in the order of his words. We want as many as possible of his figures, of form as well as of content—not only simile and metaphor, but alliteration, assonance, contrasts, balances.

And the attempt to meet these requirements of the ideal, no one who has ever made it needs to be told, is bound to lead to countless contradictions, and to end in despairing choice between evils. The better the reader of the Loeb Classics appreciates this, the more he will enjoy them; for he will be the more conscious that he has before him two works of art instead of one, and will enjoy, not only the inspiration of the original, but the inspiration of the translation. Shall we translate *all* of the intellectual content of Cicero? If we do, the subtle differences between those pairs of words with only apparently identical meaning, so frequent in Cicero, will bring a deluge of words that will overwhelm the modern stylistic ideal. Shall we try to imitate his rhythm? With the aim ever so little in mind, we shall soon be sacrificing English to rhythm. Shall we employ the ancient meters? We have agreed not to. Shall we use verse at all? The Loeb editors have concluded that it is better not to attempt it. Even good metrical translation must often slight or alter the content of the original. If we use rhythmical prose, that, too, has its difficulties, and they are hardly less than those of verse. There is the difficulty of avoiding actual verse in the midst of the prose. There is the difficulty of being rhythmic throughout. The sense requires a certain word, and no other, and the word is as ugly and cacophonous as these words that describe it; choose another word, you injure the sense; choose a longer expression, and the original's conciseness is gone. There is no way out; you must sacrifice either sense or sound, and be happy if it is not both. There is the difficulty of being rhythmical in a way the reader will understand; for there are no rules for prose rhythm, and the reader's ear may be different from yours, or he may have no sense at all of rhythm in prose, and then your virtue will be vice to him. And again, shall we follow as much as possible the Latin order, sometimes even at the expense of natural English? Shall we translate *rura cano rurisque deos*, with Mr. Postgate, "I sing the country and the country's gods," or "the country I sing, and the country's gods"? In *diles despiciam despiciamque famem* shall we try to translate alliteration and assonance and chiasmus, or render it simply, with Mr. Postgate, "I will look down on hunger as I look down on wealth"? And yet not so simply. Let anyone who is not satisfied with this rendering attempt to better it. And how far shall we allow ourselves to depart from the letter in the attempt to translate the spirit? Shall we say, with Mr. Edmonds, "don't holloa till you are out of the wood," when the original

has "do not boast till you see your enemy dead"? And if we do, shall we burden the page with a footnote in explanation of our daring? Shall we render Catullus xxvi, with Mr. Cornish:

Furius, my little farm stands exposed not to the blasts of Auster nor Favonius nor fierce Boreas or Apheliotes, but to a call of fifteen thousand two hundred sesterces. A wind that brings horror and pestilence!

or allow ourselves at least a measure of William Ellery Leonard's freedom?

Your country house is not exposed  
To any blustering gale—  
But, since your mortgagees foreclosed,  
It's now exposed for sale:  
And *this* exposure, none can doubt,  
Is likely, friend, to freeze you out.

And finally there is the difficulty—for the American—of avoiding words and phrases whose meaning and flavor in England are not the same as in his own land.

Such are a few of the difficulties in which the translator finds himself entangled. His work is a continual series of oscillations between offense against his own tongue and disloyalty to the ancient. He can fix upon no policy, except in a very general way; the individual difficulty has to be settled by itself when he meets it, and settled differently under different circumstances. There is really only one detail of policy which he can make constant, and that is to let taste be the arbiter of rival claims. If he has that priceless quality, he is comparatively safe, at least before an audience that shares its possession. If not—

In vitium ducit culpae fuga, si caret arte.

GRANT SHOWERMAN

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

